TORONTO NEIGHBOURHOODS
THE NEXT TEN YEARS

PAPERS DELIVERED AT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING CONFERENCE, TORONTO NOVEMBER 16 - 17, 1984

CITY OF TORONTO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
STEPHEN G. McLAUGHLIN, COMMISSIONER JUNE 1985

CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

by Beate Bowron

"Major social and economic forces shape the city, not the planners or the politicians"... "Planners no longer reflect the values of the communities they are serving"... "Planning interventions will be more successful if they follow the general direction of the market forces, and least successful when they run directly counter to market forces". These and many other provocative pronouncements could be heard at the two-day conference on Toronto neighbourhoods and neighbourhood planning held in November 1984.

Organized in part to mark the tenth anniversary of the Neighbourhood Planning Division of the City of Toronto's Planning and Development Department, the conference provided a forum for assessing neighbourhood planning of the past and for speculating on its future. The event was co-sponsored by the Planning and Development Department and the Ryerson School of Urban and Regional Planning, with the invaluable support of Ryerson's Continuing Education Division.

A capacity audience was made up of some 300 participants from all three levels of government, universities, the planning and development community, neighbourhood agencies and community organizations. While the majority of the registrants were from the Metropolitan Toronto region, some travelled from as far away as Vancouver and St. John's.

Misguided Reform?

Frank Lewinberg of Lewinberg Consultants Ltd. provided a conference highlight with his major retrospective paper on "Neighbourhood Planning, the Reform Years in Toronto". Urban renewal, blockbusting, high rise developments, the Spadina Expressway, working committees, citizen participation - these were the milestones of neighbourhood planning throughout the late sixties and seventies. "The reform movement in Toronto ... tried to halt change. It was successful in preventing physical change but could do nothing about the social change that was inevitable because it was occurring as a result of forces much more powerful than the planning process."

Lewinberg's central theme was that in their zeal for neighbourhood preservation, planners of the seventies seriously misjudged the then existing planning problems by failing to recognize the need to allow for organic, gradual neighbourhood change. He backed up his assertions with a thorough analysis of the planning expectations prevalent during the past fifteen years and to-day's reality.

Lewinberg's thesis was echoed and elaborated on in the "futures" papers by Ryerson's School of Urban and Regional Planning and Toronto's Planning and Development Department. Both emphasized the

importance of demographic and technological changes to Toronto's present and future neighbourhoods.

Paul Bedford, Director of the Community and Neighbourhoods Division, in presenting the City planners' collaborative efforts, focussed on the shifting economic and political context for neighbourhood planning, the apparent move from land use to social concerns and the resulting ambiguous role of neighbourhood planners. In a related argument, Larry Sherman, Chairman of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Ryerson, vividly described the potential competition for scarce resources among future neighbourhoods in a continuing flat economy. He also zeroed in on the possible use of the new Canadian Charter of Rights for judicial interpretation of property rights and the implications of this for municipal planning and the Ontario Municipal Board.

Shifting Problems Elsewhere ...

In a strongly worded commentary, lawyer Jane Pepino blamed the urban reform movement of the seventies for today's lack of affordable housing. Toronto's interminably long Secondary Plan-making exercises held up development which, in turn, drove up demand. Pent-up demand drove up rents making the introduction of rent controls the only solution that was politically feasible. To make matters worse, neighbourhood residents, having been promised "protection", expect the status quo to continue forever. Journalist David Lewis Stein was no more charitable. "Toronto has exported its slums to the suburbs", he charged. While we now have a more acceptable built form in the downtown, continued debate about the height of buildings appears hardly relevant anymore. Land use planning cannot solve social problems and the real challenges of the future lie in the social service arena.

While conceding that neighbourhood planning has helped people to express what they feel about the area they live in, journalist and former Toronto mayor John Sewell declared flatly that "neighbourhoods do not like planners". After all, planners are responsible for the "neighbourhoods" that are now being produced in the suburbs. People who can afford it live elsewhere. The most important planning task of the future will be to find ways of making the suburbs places that people want to live in.

In addition to the sessions centering around formal papers and particular topics, there were opportunities to compare notes on the state of neighbourhood planning in Canada, the U.S. and Great Britain. Invited panelists included Ray Spaxman, Director of Planning in Vancouver; David Vandor, Principal Urban Designer from the New York City Planning Department; Anthony Gibbs, First Deputy Commissioner of Neighbourhoods from Chicago; and Robert Colenutt, Planner for the Docklands area from London, England. In an emotional and highly political address, the British planner warned

participants that Canada was not immune to the trend towards a reduction of local planning controls and continued uncertain economic conditions that have caused political polarization and significant social unrest in Britain.

A Look to the Future

Toronto's Neighbourhood Planning Conference proved to be a timely exercise in retrospection that evoked critical musings of what the future may hold for neighbourhoods and for neighbourhood planners. Pervading the proceedings was a strong sense that the profession is now at a crossroads, the political milieu having changed from the euphoric days of citizen reform. The conference left its audience pondering some rather uncomfortable questions: Why is neighbourhood planning now "less action-oriented", "without goals" and "lacking vision"? Will there be room for social diversity as "people who cannot afford to live in Toronto neighbourhoods have to move out"? How will planners counteract the "new right's push toward private sector planning" and the increasing perception that they represent "an obstruction to private development"?

There is no doubt that ten years of intensive community-based planning has left its mark on Toronto's venerable neighbourhoods and has sharpened the awareness and skills of both planners and residents. The conference succeeded in forging a resolve among participants that the value of these experiences must not be lost. Rather, planners and activists should sustain the momentum in addressing the new and serious challenges on the horizon.

LEWINBERG CONSULTANTS LTD.
URBAN PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING:

THE REFORM YEARS IN TORONTO

Frank R Lewinberg

September, 1984

The research for this paper was
undertaken by Nimrod Salamon.

417 QUEEN'S QUAY WEST SUITE 350 TORONTO CANADA M5V 1A2 (416) 363-9004

Table of Contents

1 A Context for Looking at Urban Change 1
2 The Toronto Context 3

2.1 How Neighbourhoods Work 4

3 The Birth of Community Based Planning 5

3.1 The Period of Redevelopment 5
3.2 Urban Renewal 6
3.3 Private Redevelopment 8
3.4 The 1969 Official Plan 10
3.5 Applying the Framework 12

4 Growth Of The Citizens' Movement 14

4.1 Inventing a Planning Process That Worked For Redevelopment 14
4.2 Reform in Politics 15

5 Neighbourhood Planning in its Prime 18

5.1 Planning Reform 19
5.2 Planning for the Central Area 22
5.3 Housing Policy 23
5.4 Industrial Policy 24

6 The Mature State of Neighbourhood Planning 26

6.1 Physical Protection of Neighbourhoods 26
6.2 Social Instability - whitepainting 28
6.3 Public Participation has Matured 29

7 The Critique 33

7.1 Demographic Changes and Social Reality 36
7.2 Housing Crisis 37
7.3 Industrial Policy 40
7.4 Future Directions 44

Footnotes

Bibliography

NOTE TO THE READER

This paper will be presented in a considerably condensed form at the Conference on November 17, 1984. In order that it achieve its major purpose, as an important part of that conference, please restrict distribution of this paper to an absolute minimum prior to that date.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING:
THE REFORM YEARS IN TORONTO

1 A Context for Looking at Urban Change

This paper is about two closely interrelated subjects; the physical development of Toronto over the past fifteen years and the relationship between that development and the planning process of the day.

I am unfortunately at a bit of a disadvantage because I was a part player in the history of the past 10 years, and so its quite hard to look dispassionately. Also, it is dangerous to interpret the past before all the players are dead. Many of you were also actors in the storey of Toronto's development and will have your own theories and miss-understandings of past events. In order to deal with this problem I intend to be antiseptic; I will stay away from personalities and not refer for example to the period of urban renewal as Albert Rose on sax with Paul Ringer on base, nor the heady days of 1972 as opened by the David Crombie, John Sewell and Howard Cohen rhythm section.

In undertaking this analysis it became apparent that I needed an analytical framework to help me in explaining why things happened as they did. My purpose today is to offer you this framework and hope that it will be useful to all of us when thinking about the future. I assume that is the reason why one has conferences such as these.

To help sharpen this presentation I'm going to assert my theoretical framework at the start and then establish its validity through the story I tell about Toronto.

The framework is as follows:

1. Cities are in a constant process of change. That process of change is a physical reflection of basic social and economic forces in the society. Thus, the city is a valid reflection of how people in that urban society really function; their values, their priorities and their relationships internally as a community.

2. The primary determinant of urban form is the method of land allocation. By that I mean the process by which a society decides who gets what in the city, who decides what to build and for whom it is built. In Canadian cities this allocation system is the "Land Market", in which the private landowner makes the major decisions about when, what, for whom and how to build, and land price or value determines who that landowner will be.

3. Planning is a process of mediation which attempts to shape the urban form imposed by the land allocation system. However, its powers to hinder or create real change are very limited. Change will continue irrespective of the planning philosophy of the day though perhaps with a different physical appearance.

4. Planning interventions will be more successful if they follow the general direction of market forces, and least successful where they run directly counter to market forces. In the latter case, it is possible that they will create more problems than they solve, no matter how well intended they may have been. This is not to say that to follow the market system is the best way to plan our cities, but to be aware of its direction is fundamental to intervention through planning.

2 The Toronto Context

The inherent structure of Toronto lies in its earliest beginnings. We need, therefore, to go back to the point when neighbourhoods as we know them today began, the period of the industrial revolution. Before then Toronto was a village. Work places and living places were evenly spread and intermingled in all parts of the City, as were people of different social class and income group. The city was a "walking city" and most people either lived where they worked or the two were only a short distance apart. It was a community for small scale craft-based production processes.

When the period of industrialization arrived in Toronto, the economy changed radically from small scale craft-based to larger scale factory production. This change to production required a large labour force and the city experienced a tremendous growth in population. The factories located close to the major transportation facilities in the centre of the City where rail and water transport met. The first purely residential neighbourhoods in Toronto were born when those who could afford some form of transportation moved north to get away from the new factories. They vacated their homes in the centre which were then subdivided and taken over by the new factory workers who needed to be close to their work opportunities.

The essential pattern of Toronto as we know it today was established:

1. Work and home were physically separated in more or less separate locations.

2. Residential neighbourhoods, segmented by income group or social class, were born.

With minor exceptions, this essential pattern of land use and development has continued to the present. Office development took over the centre and new industry located along the railway lines entering the City from the east and west. The private

automobile and the new road network helped residents move farther out to the suburbs.

As in many North American cities, the process of suburban growth was started by upper and middle income groups. The suburbs represented the most desirable residential locations. The older inner neighbourhoods remained populated by those who could not afford to move and were dependent on the transit system, such as it was, to get them to work in the commercial centre or in the surrounding central industrial areas. These older neighbourhoods continued to function as homes for workers or as reception housing for new waves of immigrant workers who came to Toronto and started at the bottom of the social and income ladder

2.1 How Neighbourhoods Work

This early history helps to illustrate the analytic framework.

The change in the economic forces, the production and technological change, transformed the physical structure of Toronto. Work places and living places were clearly separated and the residential neighbourhood was born.

Neighbourhoods separated society into residential income groups and social classes, a reflection of the land allocation process. When one bought a house, one was buying into a life-style, into a neighbourhood which contained people generally of a certain income range. As a result, you knew that your children would play with other children of their class, and be educated to turn out more or less like those who live around them.

From the outside, the only signal which describes the social class of a neighbourhood is the price tag of the housing; that is where the land market enters in. It was then, and is now, the only economic tie or relationship between people who live in that community. Through maintaining the price, people can ensure that the sense of community in a neighbourhood is retained. Understanding this is fundamental to understanding the context for planning in Toronto.

3 The Birth of Community Based Planning

Community based planning has its roots in the plans of planners and politicians to turn Toronto into a modern metropolis after World War II. This meant two primary tasks, breaking the strangle hold of the old neighbourhoods which stifled potential redevelopment of the downtown, and building of new expressways into the centre, to make access from the new suburbs easy and comfortable. These goals were officially incorporated in the 1969 Official Plan which was the vehicle through which they were to be achieved. But opposition to these schemes developed. The process by which renewal and redevelopment was planned and implemented and the plans to build major expressways through existing neighbourhoods into the downtown infuriated many residents and led to demands for public participation.

3.1 The Period of Redevelopment

In the decades following World War II planners were obsessed with renewal. Many inner cities and downtowns, particularly in the United States, exhibited signs of physical blight and social problems. Investment in those downtowns slowed dramatically as industries and offices appeared to be following the exodus of the upper and middle classes to the suburbs. Downtown was thought to be dying.

The older neighbourhoods which surrounded the downtown appeared to be standing in the way of expansion of the downtown. Also, quite frankly, these large older neighbourhoods surrounding the downtown were filled with the lowest income groups in the society. They didn't seem like adequate neighbours for the centre, for the most prestigious part of the City.

The problem which faced the planners of the day was: "How do we create conditions for renewed investment in the centre so

that our downtown doesn't also die?" Or more specifically, "how do we get rid of the ugly inner neighbourhoods, both the old houses and the poor people, so that it can be nice and neat, and so that we can persuade the development industry to develop the downtown and not go only to the suburbs?"

For the first time in Toronto's history major redevelopment of land was being contemplated. The City was fully developed and new growth could only take place if something was torn down.

Toronto planners became obsessed with wiping out blight. As far as I can tell, blight meant anything that wasn't the suburbs. In 1944 the City of Toronto Planning Board published a study which categorized and evaluated the condition of Toronto's neighbourhoods. Over 50% of Toronto's residential areas were considered to be declining or worse.[1] Virtually all of the residential areas south of St. Clair Avenue were said to be declining. These neighbourhoods were said to exhibit signs of blight which the report said "are characterized by high density of population, high land coverage by buildings, houses on narrow lots with no side drives, resulting in excessive parking at the curb, heavy through traffic by trucks and other vehicles, inadequate park facilities for residents, obsolete architecture of houses, old-fashioned schools and intrusion of non-conforming land uses".[2]

A study in 1956 examining urban renewal in the city confirmed the view that the City was intent on demolishing the old neighbouhoods and replacing them with new structures. It concluded that at least 8% of the city's residential areas needed to be replaced and a further 40% may require redevelopment or major improvement.[3] The report identified some 27 planning areas which were recommended to undergo renewal.

3.2 Urban Renewal

Urban renewal became one of the tools used by the City in its preoccupation with blight. In order to make the city safe for redevelopment, it proposed to clean up the blighted areas and rehouse the poor residents in blocks of publicly built housing. The theory under which the city seemed to operate was that the existing residential neighbouhoods around the core represented such a severe disincentive to investment and redevelopment that

public sector initiative was required to clear the way and create conditions for change.

The socially motivated urban renewal legislation intended to build public housing was, in fact, used as a vehicle to clear the land. By the mid 60's, its real purpose was more evident when the requirement that public housing be built was dropped. It became possible to turn urban renewal areas over to other uses and interests.

The process of urban renewal occured in the following manner. It began with the publication of reports advocating the expropriation, demolition and redevelopment of blighted areas. This set in motion a cycle of deterioration in these neighbourhoods. An aura of fear and uncertainty was created in designated renewal areas as the city implemented the plans in bits and pieces and over a prolonged period of time. In the intervening time, the city did not even bother to enforce minimum housing standard by-laws. Owners of homes in designated renewal areas became reluctant to invest money in them. Those who could, got out quickly. Landlords let their houses run down and more transient, unstable residents moved into those neighbourhoods.

In some cases the city actually built public housing, while in many instances, renewal plans were dragged on for a decade without being implemented. It is difficult to understand how this situation could have existed in most of the residential neighbourhoods around the city core for a decade without strong opposition arising.

Urban renewal schemes were implemented without any form of public participation. In the planning for the huge Alexandra Park urban renewal project, plans were passed from planner to planner and from one agency and level of government to another from the mid 50's into the 60's. Residents did not understand what was happening and being planned for their area. Under pressure, the city finally held public meetings which created outraged opposition.

The animosity created by the approach of the Alexandra Park renewal project and the long delays involved in large renewal schemes led to much smaller scale schemes. Attention shifted to so-called pockets of blight. Studies recommended small areas to undergo renewal clearance and the erection of small scale public housing. These small pocket renewal areas included

neighbourhoods such as Don Mount, Trefann Court, Don Vale and Kensington.

It was hoped that the smaller projects would be more manageable and that expropriation, demolition and redevelopment could all be undertaken with minimal delays and resident opposition. In fact, it helped spread the opposition around more quickly. In Don Mount, expropriation began only 6 months after the plan was prepared in 1965. But resident opposition grew and moved to other renewal projects. In 1966 the city approved a plan for the total demolition of Trefann Court. This marked the beginning of major confrontation between residents and City Hall until the federal government killed the program in 1969.

3.3 Private Redevelopment

Private speculators and developers in the 50's and 60's saw the inherent value of land in the central city and began assembling land for redevelopment. Developers were following what they saw to be the lead of the City and the market. They were encouraged by the city politicians and planners. However, their actions infuriated the residents in the affected neighbourhoods. Opposition to redevelopment schemes mounted and the demand for public participation in planning was soon to give way to reform.

Private land assembly fed off the urban renewal process and the clear direction being put forward by the City. In many of these residential neighbourhoods a quiet but gradual process of change in landownership took place. Land values were depressed due to renewal plans and so developers assembled land cheaply. Throughout the 50's and 60's, the formation of land assemblies continued in the neighbourhoods around the city core.

As land was being assembled, the homes were at first rented out and many became rooming houses. Necessary home repairs and maintenance work was not done. These new absentee landlords preferred to spend as little money on their new acquisitions as possible, consequently homes continued to deteriorate. By the end of the 60's many of the homes in the land assemblies were torn down. Assembled land was cleared of

their buildings only to be replaced by parking lots. A belt of parking lots was created between the city core and the residential neighbourhoods.

Thus the process of private land assembly added considerable instability to inner city neighbourhoods. There was an increase in tenant occupancy at the expense of owners, and in many cases the least stable type of tenant dominated as homes were converted to rooming houses. The demolition of homes and the creation of parking lots made things even worse for the neighbourhood.

This was the period of the construction of high rise apartment buildings. Where they could, developers built large rental apartment buildings. In many neighbourhoods 10 or 20 old houses were assembled and replaced by a 10 or 20 storey apartment building which contained 100 or 200 homes.

Massive apartment construction changed the face of some neighbourhoods. They introduced a totally different form of housing in the once low-rise neighbourhoods. The buildings were quite out of scale with the surrounding houses and the population density increased dramatically in a very small area. The form of housing contained mainly 1 and 2 bedroom apartments which catered to single people and couples. This was very different from the traditional family composition of most neighbourhoods of the time.

The reaction of residents to the private redevelopment of apartments led to major battles between residents, private developers and the city. People were angry at the tactics of the developers. Tenants were opposed to being displaced and homeowners being threatened if they blocked the redevelopment schemes. The change in built form from low-rise houses to high-rise apartments, the increase in local populations and the switch away from family occupancy to single and tenant occupancy, fuelled the opposition of residents and the demand for public participation in planning for these areas.

3.4 The 1969 Official Plan

The planning rationale of the 69 plan was very clear. The city thought the core was dying due to the surrounding blight. In order to clean up the blight, the city channelled development to these areas by increasing the permitted densities. This caused a rise in the property values and made those neighbourhoods attractive for redevelopment. Since the city saw that public urban renewal was losing its support amongst other levels of government and could not be relied upon, it turned to encouraging private industry to redevelop the areas around the city core.

The 69 Plan also confirmed two major new expressways, the Spadina and Scarborough, from the west and the east into the downtown. The planning for these expressways was perhaps the single most important element in the call for reform in the planning process. In the early reports there had been a third expressway known as the Crosstown, which was to connect the north/south expressways to the east and west. The expressway plan was part of the overall strategy to ensure the health of the city core by making it easily accessible to the residents of Metro who now lived in widely dispersed suburbs.

Public urban renewal and private redevelopment did not happen in a vacuum. The processes of renewal and redevelopment was stimulated by the various renewal plans of the 50's and 60's. The 1956 Urban Renewal Study, for example, advocated higher densities around Yonge/Eglinton, in the Annex and south of Bloor Street east of Yonge over to what became St. Jamestown. A predecessor to St. Jamestown, the Parliament Syndicate, submitted a proposal contending that the small lots there would require the help of the city in expropriating land.[4] Even though that proposal did not pass, in the early 1960's others did. There was a close tie between what private developers did and what the city wanted.

The city supported this activity also through the establishment of the Development Department to attract new development to the downtown. The Development Department, in an effort to clean up the city and promote growth and development, got involved in both public urban renewal and private redevelopment.

Work on the new city plan commenced in the early 60's and by 1966 the initial proposals were published. Not surprisingly, the number of real estate transactions in the residential neighbourhoods rose dramatically during this time as speculators saw the direction which was being publicly proposed. The 69 Plan was the culmination of nearly 20 years of planning and confirmed what private developers expected and had been operating under for nearly a decade.

The Official Plan cleared up any ambiguities about the type and extent of development that was to occur and what Toronto was going to look like in the future. High density residential development was encouraged for the neighbourhoods around the city core and at major transit intersections. Massive redevelopment was to take place in areas like the Annex, the Grange, Yonge-Eglinton, Bloor-Keele and the entire stretch south of Bloor Street to the west of Parliament Street. The plan also confirmed existing high rise developments such as St. Jamestown and the Grange and sanctioned others which had been proposed.

The planners also anticipated an increase in the population and that there would be strong demand for housing in the city.[5] However, the plan stated that due to the decline in the amount of residential land in the City and in order to ensure adequate living conditions, the need for family housing could not be accommodated in the City. The documents supporting the plan boldly stated that:

> "It is obvious that most low rental housing must be built outside the City. Indeed most new family housing must be provided outside the City."[6]

New apartment construction was seen as the principle means of increasing the supply of housing. Most of the land in the inner city residential areas was designated for high rise apartment redevelopment. For example, 40% of the area of the Annex was to be rezoned for apartments. The plan called for the construction of over 60,000 apartment units over a 15 year period. The percentage of people living in apartments was projected to rise from 10% in 1961 to 25% by 1981.[7]

The expressway plans which followed the logic of modern transportation planning caused major controversy. They

constituted the first direct impact of the planning philosophy of the day on the middle and upper income neighbourhoods to the north, north/east and north/west of the city. These were not like the low income neighbourhoods which had borne most of the changes which have been described thus far. These communities were not going to take proposals to drive massive expressways through their neighbourhoods, to face the expropriation of their homes and the lowering of their property values without a fight.

They were determined to be heard and included in the decision making process, and they had the ability and sophistication to tackle City Hall at its own game. The Crosstown expressway which was to go through some of Toronto's most affluent neighbourhoods was eliminated even before the final plan was published. The war that was Spadina is well known to just about everyone.

3.5 Applying the Framework

In order to explain what was happening in Toronto in those days one has to step back and look at the real situation. Land immediately adjacent to the centre of the city was potentially very valuable, yet its true market potential was being held back because of the neighbourhoods which comprised it. Clearly this constituted a real impediment to private investment in the city. It seemed impossible to distinguish between the physical neighbourhoods which were old houses and the social community which was the lowest income group in the city.

The motive power of change was to be the market which would allow the potential value of that land to be realized. Thus what the planners were doing was to recognize that the land under the inner neighbourhoods was too valuable for the groups to whom it was presently allocated, and then to create conditions which would allow the market process to do its work. This meant of course that the old neighbourhoods would have to go and the people relocated to less desirable locations. The initial emphasis on public housing, socially motivated as it was, was lost as time passed.

The '69 Plan was a rational solution to the dilemma in which the City found itself. The existence of so-called slums and poor

people in the inner city artificially held down land values. By the end of the decade, land values had bloomed but were stopped from ripening to their natural level because of the blight. In order to realize the potential value of inner city lands and achieve redevelopment, the blight and poor people had to be eliminated. The proposed Official Plan of 1969 was the vehicle through which this was to be achieved.

Looking back at the 69 Official Plan many of the assumptions and goals of the plan have been proven correct. Extensive apartment development has occurred to meet the demand, in fact, considerably more than had been predicted. Growth in the downtown has been phenomenal. Furthermore, reflecting the realities of the land market, low income family housing, other than small pockets of government assisted phousing, have not been built in the city, as it was too valuable to allocate to these groups.

However, the major weakness of the planning process was its inability to perceive discontent with the city's development schemes. Planners and politicians were unable to see the frustrations of residents and their opposition to the renewal and redevelopment proposals in the late 60's because they were sitting comfortably tucked away in City Hall.

The planners of the day were not bad people, nor stupid. They practiced the "professional" approach to planning with its emphasis on objectivity and rationality. These planners were technocrats who perceived their role as giving good advice to decision-makers and staying above politics. They were sincere in their concern for the need for growth and expansion of the city core. Planners were being realistic in attempting to create and mold Toronto into a modern city which would be able to function effectively in the modern age.

Looking back it seems that the planners and politicians of the day must have been very naive. What they didn't understand was that planning for redevelopment is not the same as planning for new development. There are vested interests in the land which have to be catered to if change is to occur smoothly. While their technical analysis of what needed to change may have been correct, their management of the process left a great deal to be desired. To them planning was essentially a technical process which could be resolved by careful analysis and clear reporting. That process had worked well when they were planning new development. They were startled to find out

that it is not so simple in the new era of redevelopment.

4 Growth Of The Citizens' Movement

4.1 Inventing a Planning Process That Worked For Redevelopment

It was the prospect of the loss of their homes that galvanized residents. The low compensation values that owners in Don Mount received after expropriation, created fierce antagonism. Their experiences provided a warning to the residents in Kensington and later Trefann Court that they could only be hurt by urban renewal.

The realization by residents of designated renewal areas that they shared common interests and concerns led to the formation of residents' associations. Community leaders organized the residents to confront City Hall. The tactics they adopted of appearing at City Hall, confronting politicians and taking legal action set the stage of the new tactics of opposition.

The constant vigilance on the part of residents' associations and the changing political climate of the late 60's made it impossible to proceed with the traditional style of urban renewal. A political resolution to the conflict was needed. City politicians were under pressure to resolve the problem and so with great reluctance, they were prepared to embrace any solution which might cool things down. The "Working Committee" was the answer and the official recognition of Working Committees marked the beginning of the institutionalization of citizen participation.

The Working Committee consisted of representatives of local residents organizations, businessmens groups, aldermen and city officials, including a planner. Initially, the residents saw

the working committee as a vehicle through which to oppose undesired change in their area. However, it soon became a tool for residents to devise and propose alternatives.

In Trefann Court, planning had been forced out of City Hall and transformed into a participatory process. The selection of a planner to work with the community was made by the community residents. For the first time, the city and politicians had committed themselves to a measure of joint planning. The planner in Trefann Court committed himself to consensus decision making and forwarded only those recommendations agreed to by the working committee. City Council almost became a rubber stamp approving the recommendations of the working committee. The role of the planner was to translate the views of the committee into a plan. While in formal terms the committee passed on its recommendations to City Council, in practice it made policy.

Trefann Court was the archetype of the working committee. Public participation was heightened here to a level not reached again. True citizen participation was reached in Trefann because there was an active urban renewal scheme for the area which added implementation powers to the planning process and which was dealing directly with people's lives. Politicians, activists and the media focussed on the Trefann working committee recognizing that something important was taking place which would leave its mark on the way planning was conducted in the city.

Following this precedent, working committees were used in other neighbourhood planning situations. The working committee became a useful tool to solve and deal with very hot planning issues, such as high rise redevelopment and large private assemblies.

The concept of organizing neighbourhood residents to thrash out a plan with city officials revolutionized city planning in Toronto. The way to solve political issues was to set up a working committee made up of residents and politicians. It was felt that the perception that control of the decision making rested with the working committee would cool the issues down. The working committee proved to be an acceptable way of allowing the planning process to continue in the new world of redevelopment.

4.2 Reform in Politics

The growth in opposition to public urban renewal, private redevelopment and expressways was matched by a shift in municipal politics. Residents in working class areas who were facing the loss of their homes and expulsion from their neighbourhoods brought about a change in local politics. Politicians had treated citizens in a paternalistic manner saying they knew what was best for the residents and would look after their best interests. Residents felt they were being ignored. Recognizing City Hall as the problem, the residents in Ward 7, which contained many of the urban renewal schemes, supported two reform politicians in the 1969 election.

The election of these reform politicians was extremely important for the development of the reform movement. Together with the election of several quasi reformers from affluent city neighbourhoods, they began to raise the issues within City Hall. They challenged the status quo at every opportunity attacking old guard politicians, the bureaucracy and the decision making process itself.

In order to have a stronger voice at Council, the reform and quasi-reform politicians representing various political shades allied together. They agreed that the key problems were transportation and redevelopment, that the causes of the problems were unresponsive politicians and technocrats. [8] They believed that reform and change could be brought about by the election of a new slate of politicians.

In 1969 the issue of expressways exploded. Residents of Rosedale had been working on deleting the Crosstown expressway from the City Plan while opposition to the Spadina expressway mounted in neighbourhoods such as the Annex. The Spadina fight was the key event of the reform movement. It initiated middle class involvement in the reform movement. Entire middle class communities which stood in the path of the expressway were mobilized to stop it. The expressway combined many of the fears of the middle class and challenged their beliefs in government and the democratic process. They attacked politicians who supported the expressway proposal and experts who wrote reports justifying its need. The threat of destruction of their neighbourhoods was their rallying cry.

Middle class community reaction also centered on the less obviously defined changes which were occuring in neighbourhoods. The apartments which were being built in some neighbourhoods could just as easily be proposed in their own back yard. They saw private redevelopment as the cause of the reduction in the numbers of children and families in residential city neighbourhoods. They attempted to stop these changes and preserve the traditional family life of the community. The basic change to the family base and orientation of many neighbourhoods which had been occuring in most neighbourhoods through the 60's led to unease in these communities.

It became clear that the social and physical changes occuring in neighbourhoods were unacceptable to most communities. Social changes were less easily definable. Consequently opposition revolved around the physical changes taking place and the expressway plans. Residents throughout the city felt potentially vulnerable to high rise developments in their neighbourhoods. Between 1961-1971 some 36,000 apartment dwellings were built in the city.[9] Family style housing was being replaced by high rise apartments catering to single and non-traditional households. The vehicle around which middle class residents could organize in order to preserve the traditional social structure and environment of their community was the destruction of low rise homes and their replacement by high rise apartments.

The Spadina and Crosstown expressway sparked their involvement, but the issue of private redevelopment led them on. The threat of apartment towers in north Toronto or middle class High Park would not be tolerated. A confederation of resident and ratepayer associations was formed to link citizen groups fighting developments like South St. Jamestown and Village By the Grange. The middle class was well organized under strong leadership and sound technical and political expertise.

There were two closely connected targets to their attack: government and private developers. Developers were seen as unscrupulous wheeler dealers who bribed government officials and used every possible trick to build their towers. Profit maximization was being achieved at the expense of the city's neighbourhoods. The image that the middle class residents had of private developers has probably remained to this day.

Government also bore the hostility of the middle class. Residents had been lied to and deceived by politicians and government officials. Politicians were not seen to be accountable to the electorate. City officials kept information from residents and city government was more accessible to developers then to residents. Residents could no longer sit back and take what was happening to them. They had had enough and were now going to redress the imbalance.

People who had never before been involved in local politics suddenly attended City Council meetings voicing their opposition to redevelopment proposals. As John Sewell recalls, "their first experience at City Hall tended to be one of almost disbelief". [10] Politicians would not listen nor answer objections raised by residents; instead they consulted with representatives of developers and conducted Council meetings as if they were a private club. The result was that the 1972 elections brought in a wave of reform politicians to City Council.

New politicians were trained in neighbourhood organizations and represented the interests of the city's neighbourhood residents. The council was dominated by a philosophy of middle class reform and signalled a new phase in local politics and planning in Toronto.

Uprooting working class neighbourhoods which had been going on for a decade might be overlooked, but altering the stability of larger middle class neighbourhoods would not be tolerated. The planners had exceeded the bounds of what was politically acceptable by communities throughout the city.

5 Neighbourhood Planning in its Prime

The reform Council came into power on a platform which called for the preservation of neighbourhoods, neighbourhood stability, controlling growth, and concerns about the need for affordable family housing in the City. This responded to a sense that the family base of neighbourhoods was in jeopardy as high rise buildings removed grade related family homes and inserted in their place single people and couples.

A major change occurred in the processes at City Hall. Now, citizens were to have equal access to government. Residents appeared in front of Council and various city departments and bodies and were listened to. Using their political leverage, citizens were assured that their views would be taken into careful consideration and would be reflected in the final decisions.

The development industry was viewed with suspicion. Land developers were portrayed as the bad guys even though planners, government and developers had all followed a similar line. In order to understand what happened, we will look briefly at four interrelated planning policies which clearly define the planning/political efforts of the past ten years: the reform of planning, the Central Area Plan, the City's housing policy and the Industrial Policy.

5.1 Planning Reform

Throughout the 60's, the planning mechanism had remained isolated from the growth of opposition taking place. It was not responsive to the voices of residents and actively promoted the growth philosophy. Planners took their direction from a technical perspective and promoted what they thought was good for the city in the longrun. They were not concerned with politics.

Although the City had been divided up into planning districts for the purpose of preparing plans, planning was undertaken from a centralized bureaucracy at City Hall. Planners went about their business without consulting residents and presented their final proposals at a public meeting.

But the conflict in Trefann Court in the ealy 1970's changed all that. With the success of the working committee approach came changes to the structure of the planning department. A new Inner Neighbourhoods division was created, to deal specifically with the neighbourhoods around the downtown, those most clearly vulnerable to change from the process set in motion by the 69 Official Plan. Symbolically, the planner of the Trefann working committee headed this new Inner Neighbourhoods division.

The new planning approach was clearly directed at those areas where rapid change was taking place. Neighbourhood site offices were opened up in the inner city areas modelled on the Trefann process. Planning studies were begun in each neighbourhood to re-examine the Part I Official Plan, deal with the hot issues and undertake Part II plans. Several major development proposals were blocked and working committees established to negotiate acceptable solutions. For example, the Village by The Grange proposal was completely redesigned from a proposal for 3 towers of 27 floors.

The planners chosen for the new type of planning were different from the old timers. They were more attuned to the student politics of the day coming out of the era of Viet Nam protest and the growth of political activism in the late 60's. The same can be said of many of the community representatives who were actively involved in the process. Many of the people chosen to work as planners in neighbourhood site offices had no formal academic training in planning. Rather, they were chosen because their preference was to work with communities. A planning degree was not a criteria. These planners had an idealism and commitment to public participation. The traditional planners who thought they knew all the answers were not acceptable to the residents. What was required were people not associated with the old style planning.

A new planning philosophy had developed and slowly become institutionalized at City Hall. It was oriented to encouraging public participation and defending neighbourhoods from development pressures. The aim was the retention of family housing and stabilizing communities. Site offices became the symbol of the new planning philosophy. The neighbourhood planner seldom worked at City Hall but met with residents at the site office. This became the precondition of the new planning process.

The creation of Part II plans arose out of the 69 Official Plan which called for more detailed plans on a neighbourhood basis. But in reality, the Part II plans reversed the 69 plan and changed its goals of growth and expansion to one of neighbourhood stabilization. The new Part II plans allowed for very little physical change beyond what already existed. Thus stability was achieved by outlawing most forms of physical change in the neighbourhoods.

Planners were not just dealing with formal land use planning in the process of developing a Part II plan. There were many other issues involved in the neighbourhood and the Part II planning process offered a vehicle for tackling them. This often led to community organizing and advocacy on the part of the planner. The energy of the neighbourhood planner was spent on a wide range of issues which often went far beyond the realm of traditional planning, but were seen as essential issues to be tackled if the goal of stability was to be achieved. Issues such as the provision of assisted housing, health care, day care, parking problems, skid-row and other social concerns took up much of the planners and the community's time. Consequently, the Part II plans took many years to complete and the process of doing them turned into one of neighbourhood participation and problem solving rather than simply the act of writing a formal plan.

With the success of the site office planning approach, the inner neighbourhood planning group of about 10 planners was expanded. It was clear that the new type of planning worked, the confrontations were being handled. As a result it was decided to expand the planning program of the Inner Neighbourhoods to the entire city outside of the core. Problems were not restricted to the inner city but existed throughout the city. The new approach was to be used to resolve political-planning issues in all areas of the city.

In 1974 the City established the Community and Neighbourhood Division of the Planning Board. The planning staff and budget were greatly expanded. Site offices were opened in neighbourhoods where Part II plans were to be prepared. Planning was decentralized to the neighbourhood level and planners moved out of their City Hall offices. Young and energetic people were hired to work as planners in the site offices. They had an idealism that reflected the mood of the time. Some of the old guard planners left while those who stayed adapted to the new method. Community planning and community participation was the new order of the day.

Some 14 planning site offices were opened up in neighbourhoods to establish closer contact with the neighbourhood and develop greater responsiveness to the community needs. Neighbourhood planning using the basic model of the Working Committee gained popularity and acceptance and became institutionalized. Planning had transferred to the community level and became responsive to the concerns of residential neighbourhoods.

The beginning of the Part II planning process saw a level of citizen participation never before witnessed in Toronto. Residents had rallied their forces and transformed planning to serve their needs. It was a remarkable turn of events from the support of private developers and market forces of the previous decade. Planning was now being successfully employed in protecting the city's residential neighbourhoods.

5.2 Planning for the Central Area

The early years of reform were filled with major symbolism to show that the bad old days of unfettered growth were over. I have described how neighbourhood planning was transformed in both form and substance, that was the first act. Then there were a number of key decisions. First, was the decision to back-off the expressways, and then there were decisions to back-off support for a number of major development proposals and either kill them or renegotiate them. But, probably the most important and most symbolic of all was the 45 foot holding by-law which shook not only the City but the whole country in its disregard for the right of private property.

Following the election of a reform council in 1972 an array of by-laws ranging from height restrictions, down zoning and other controls were placed on development. The city imposed a holding by-law limiting the height of new development in the central city area to 45 feet and/or 40,000 square feet in size. This also included some of the inner neighbourhoods. The purpose of the by-law was to give the city time to re-evaluate the 1969 Official Plan. The new reform politicians who had been elected on an anti-development platform wanted to break from the past. This included turning down Metro Centre, modifying Eaton Centre and defeating proposals to demolish Union Station.

The adoption of the Central Area Plan in 1976 changed the policies of the 69 Official Plan. It focussed growth and development in the city core and guaranteed the stability of the inner residential neighbourhoods. The old concept that growth

is good was challenged by blocking the expansion of the central core into surrounding residential neighbourhoods. Although these policies were included in Part II plans for each neighbourhood, the symbolism of the plan was important. It made a clear statement that the inner city neighbourhoods were to be preserved. The provision of housing for low and moderate income people was also encouraged through mechanisms such as density bonuses. Private commercial developers were encouraged to provide public housing and family housing in their developments.

I'm not going to attempt to deal with the central area in this paper, as it would justify an analysis of twice the length on its own. It is sufficient to say merely that the drastic action which was taken illustrates two things. First, that the private market and the related planning process of the previous decade or so had been very successful in bringing development to Toronto's downtown. In fact the city was booming. Second, it was necessary to clearly demonstrate to the citizens of the city that their new government was prepared to take a tough line with the developers. Thus the developers remained the bad guys, and the government and planners who had aided and abetted them through the 50's and 60's were nowhere to be seen.

5.3 Housing Policy

A major critique of the previous pro-development thrust was that family housing and in particular affordable family housing had been driven out of Toronto by the apartment boom and redevelopment for other land uses. The private development industry was only interested in building for markets which were profitable. Thus all forms of affordable housing were simply not being produced. In particular, housing for families had not been produced in Toronto through the 60's when virtually all the housing catered to singles and couples in high rise apartment buildings.

The construction of public housing had also ended in the late 60's due to the major opposition to urban renewal as well as the poor image which public housing projects had attracted wherever they were developed. People saw the public housing projects as ghettos for the poor which did as much to disrupt

neighbourhoods as did the apartment towers. Also the tendency of the Ontario Housing Corporation was increasingly to utilize the same high rise tower form of building as did the private developers.

Affordable housing for families was therefore seen as a central part of the new reform strategy to redress the wrongs of the past. It was clear that the private sector would not provide the necessary affordable housing and as a result the City decided to enter the vacuum and get into the housing business itself. Fortunately legislation had recently been enacted to enable cities to get funds for land banking and for the development of non-profit housing catering to a mix of very low and moderate income families. Again we cannot do much more than just touch on this issue in this paper.

The development of a new housing policy was closely connected with the creation of the neighbourhood planning process. It was the planners in the site offices who, with a considerable measure of community support, helped to articulate the housing problem as they saw it. It was through the planners and the neighbourhood planning processes that the sites for land banking were identified. The first few projects in which the city became involved were direct acquisitions from developers who had been stopped in their tracks by the new reform political/planning process and had sold their holdings to the city, these included Dundas/Sherbourne, Huron/Madison and Dundas/Beverley. The planners were strongly behind the city's housing policies which they had helped draft. At every opportunity they negotiated for assisted housing in return for concessions for developers.

The Housing Department was created at virtually the same time as the Community and Neighbourhood Division of the Planning Department was formed. The new housing policy and program translated into a major commitment by the city to the housing sector flowing directly out of the neighbourhood planning philosophy. It was intended to ensure the provision of housing in neighbourhoods and in the centre for low and moderate income families, and to retain a mix of incomes and social classes in the City.

In its early years the program was very successful. The city undertook a large variety of projects which included buildings as small as 10 or 20 units, larger projects of 100 to 200 units and the St Lawrence neighbourhood and Frankel Lambert in

which the number of homes were in the thousands. The city also acquired some existing buildings and even existing single houses. The goal of spreading the projects to all areas of the city was achieved successfully.

5.4 Industrial Policy

The final product of the reform years which I wish to focus on was the question of industry. Since 1950 manufacturing industry in the city has undergone a steady decline with firms moving out to the suburbs. Between 1950-1971 the city lost half of its manufacturing jobs. [11] Due to the availability of cheap land enabling the construction of large land intensive factories with good transportation access and minimal environmental conflicts, suburban locations attracted industry from the city.

Although the 1969 Official Plan called for the retention of industry in the city, by the early 70's no specific action had been taken to reinforce this. Between 1957 and 1965, several reports and urban renewal studies examined the decline of industries in the city and a policy was evolved for making use of urban renewal programs in industrial areas. By expropriating land, and tearing down existing buildings, land was to be assembled by the city for new industrial development. However, the freeze on urban renewal funds in 1969 put an end to the industrial renewal.

Industry in the city was slowly being replaced by other uses. The city's zoning did not make a distinction between commercial and industrial uses. Thus, commercial uses could locate in industrial areas and displace them. Pressure was exerted by commercial expansion into industrial areas increasing the likelihood of further industrial displacement as commercial uses could afford to pay more for the land.

In the initial years of reform the planners and politicians saw the decaying industrial areas as potential for new housing development. The city was faced with having to find housing sites which did not disrupt existing neighbourhoods. The industrial areas appeared to be ripe for change and the land was relatively cheap. In changing the zoning on such land the city could ensure that its assisted housing goals were met and

that it could also acquire land for city housing production.

However, the neighbourhood based planning process began to question the initial assumption that industrial areas were appropriate for major redevelopment. A sense developed that industrial areas were worth preserving in their own right. Planners argued that the relocation of industry out of the city would result in undesirable social consequences. The loss of industrial jobs was causing working class communities to lose their economic base. Working class residents would have to travel out to the suburbs for work and consequently the residential place for working class people in the city was becoming more tenuous. [12] The planners saw that the stability of working class residential neighbourhoods was being upset through the destruction of industrial areas.

It was decided that something had to be done to reverse this trend. A special industrial zoning category was created to separate commercial uses from industrial in the zoning, and thereby protect industry from competition from high commercial values. While some housing was initially allowed in selected industrial areas such as St. Lawrence, the city had decided to save much of the existing industrial areas for industrial use.

The protection of industry came out of the neighbourhood planning process and the policy for neighbourhood stability. Planners saw that in order to preserve working class neighbourhoods, there was a need to ensure that the places of work for working people were also to be retained. Planners accepted the concept of stability and went about building a constituency for support of the new policy of preserving industry.

Arising out of the policy of industrial protection has grown the formation by the City, of industrial coordinating committees. These are comprised of industrialists, politicians and city staff in each of the three major industrial districts. The aims of these committees are to promote industry in the districts and serve as spokesmen for industrialists to City Council on industrial concerns.

To further demonstrate Council's resolve to keep industry in the city, a mini division was created within the Planning Department, called the Economic Development division. Council appointed an Industrial Development officer to assist industry with the bureaucracy at City Hall and to promote the cause of

industry. A proposal has also been made to create a City Economic Development Corporation as a way of saving and creating new industrial jobs in the City and to encourage industrial redevelopment.

6 The Mature State of Neighbourhood Planning

6.1 Physical Protection of Neighbourhoods

The reform movement grew in response to rampant redevelopment. Homeowners in the city saw that the expansion of high rise residential and commercial development promoted by the City would lead to pressures for wholesale change in all neighbourhoods. It threatened the basis of their own neighbourhood, either directly or indirectly. They also feared that the construction of expressways would disrupt the stability of their neighbourhood and reduce the property values in the immediate and surrounding area.

The answer was to block most of the avenues for change through opening up government to citizen scrutiny, participation in decision making and placing controls on growth. It led to the passage of land use regulations and the formulation of new restrictive plans. What was achieved in the Part II Plans has been the physical protection of residential neighbourhoods, or more honestly put a virtual prohibition of physical change. In the older existing neighbourhoods the physical form of the neighbourhood has been preserved in the shape of what existed prior to World War II.

Height restrictions and zoning designations make any physical changes in these areas very difficult and certainly uneconomical to undertake. The new Part II Plans for these areas reduced the zoning to reflect more or less what was already physically standing. In South-east Spadina the new Part II plan permits

medium density development of four storeys only along the major streets. The internal portions of the community have been designated as low density residential areas with a maximum height of 38 feet. Yet the context in which this neighbourhood exists has changed. It is in fact a part of the downtown fabric and is quite different from a neighbourhood far from the centre. There is little recognition of the fact that the area contains the Art Gallery of Ontario, Chinatown and is surrounded by the University on the north, a very urbane Queen Street on the south, University Avenue on the east and Spadina Avenue on the west. If ever an area was ripe for change, that is it. And change it will, irrespective of the Part II plan.

The Part II plan for the Annex is very similar. Little new development is permitted with most of the area zoned for low density residential with a height limit of 38 feet. Even the medium density residential areas along Spadina Road and St. George Street, where apartments already predominate are restricted to a height of 45 feet. What is entirely ignored in these plans is the fact that since the Annex was developed, two major subway lines have been built linking this neighbourhood to the downtown and the rest of Metro. It makes no sense that as a community we invest millions of dollars in a subway system and then try and keep the area around the stations where the subway system intersects as it was 100 years ago.

The new protective plans and zoning do not take into account the location of these areas as inner city neighbourhoods. With the City having invested millions of dollars in new infrastructure the new plans do not permit much intensification so as to make greater use of these facilities and services.

Initially the targets of the plans were private development schemes. Due to the early excesses of private developers, planners and residents regarded all development proposals by the private sector as undesirable. Concern centered not only on the physical aspects of the proposals but also on the fact that they were being proposed by private developers. Today, however, even public schemes are affected by the physical protection of neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood planning has been molded to protect residential neighbourhoods from all types of physical intrusion and redevelopment.

6.2 Social Instability - whitepainting

The physical protection and stabilization of the city's residential neighbourhoods has not led to the preservation of the neighbourhoods' social mix. Instead, a process of social change has taken place. The central city neighbourhoods have been saved from the wrecker's ball and high rise redevelopment effectively halted. But these neighbourhoods have, at the same time, been made safe for renewed investment in the existing housing stock and opened them to whitepainting.

Central city neighbourhoods are going through a process of considerable improvement and rehabilitation of their housing stock. As middle income groups seek more space than the former working class inhabitants, single dwellings previously occupied by two families are deconverted to accommodate just one family; rooming houses with say ten rooms become just two apartments. Due to the forces of the market, property values in these neighbourhoods are increasing and the neighbourhood population is shifting from being low and moderate income to middle and upper income.

Many of the people for whom neighbourhoods were to be preserved have in the end been displaced from their neighbourhood due to the escalating value of property. Tenants can no longer afford to pay the high rents or are displaced as a result of the property being sold to those who can afford the higher prices. Homeowners and speculators often sell their homes to capitalize on the higher values.

Thus, throughout the 1970's and 1980's, the population in the residential neighbourhoods of the city has changed dramatically while the built form has remained relatively unchanged. From the beginning of neighbourhood planning reform in the early 1970's, whitepainting has been quickened. As early as 1973 it was estimated that whitepainting was resulting in the loss of 1,000 houses per year being transferred from low and moderate income to middle and upper income households.[13] The city was losing more housing for low income people through private rehabilitation than it ever lost through demolition, redevelopment and urban renewal. The fact remains that whitepainting, as a result of neighbourhood protectionism, removes the house from the stock of low income housing just as if it were demolished.

The policy of neighbourhood protection stimulated the whitepainting process. It preserved the physical shape of the neighbourhood but led to as drastic a social change as that contemplated in the 69 Plan. Thus at the same time as neighbourhood planning was routinized, inner city residential areas were being transformed as the preserve of the middle and upper classes.

The "stable neighbourhoods policy" has translated into physical stability but not social stability. This was found to be acceptable because it has gone along with increased property values. Those people who have gained have been more politically powerful in the society than those who are being hurt.

6.3 Public Participation has Matured

Throughout the 1970's task forces, working committees and planning groups operated in a variety of planning situations. By the end of the decade, resident mobilization had opened up government to the public. Politicians were elected who supported their concerns and the result was the implementation of planning reform leading to the institutionalization of neighbourhood planning.

In many of the residential neighbourhoods in the city, the nature of the resident population has changed over the past decade. Neighbourhood protection brought a rise in property values and an influx of newcomers. A shift to higher income residents has resulted in their concern with different issues. The older residents believed they could preserve their neighbourhood from the physical and social changes taking place around them. They strongly supported the social approach to planning and actively encouraged the provision of assisted housing, health care, etc. But newcomers, who have invested large amounts of money in their properties, want to maintain and increase property values and continue the process of renovations in the neighbourhood. With an influx of more and more upper income residents in city neighbourhoods, the concerns of the original residents will inevitably be lost to the interests of the more numerous high income residents. The concerns of city resident's associations reflect more and more

the interests of this affluent group.

After a decade of citizen activism, citizen participation in Toronto is on the decline. The long drawn out Part II planning process outlasted the stamina and interest of most residents. While at first there was strong resident participation and involvement in the planning function, after several years of attending regular meetings, residents dropped out or moved. The reform of public participation has not led to continuing citizen involvement in decision making. The number of site offices have declined again, now to only 4 in the City and the planners have returned to City Hall.

The major reason for the decline in resident activism has to do with the physical protection of the city's neighbourhoods. Once the city's residents felt that the pressures of expressway construction and high rise redevelopment had diminished and would be contained, they faded out of the spotlight. There was no need for active resident vigilance. The decline in public participation can be related directly to the success of the movement in saving residential neighbourhoods.

The idealism of the early reform days has also vanished. It became clearer to the planners and community activists that they were engaged in an exercise of protecting property values. The community's were found to be as hostile to a proposal from Cityhome for assisted housing as they were from the developers. The communities were also now prepared to work with developers through the participation process provided by the planners to arrive at solutions which would not threaten their property values. The private development proposals were no longer for extreme physical or social change. It became increasingly clear that the function of planning had been to mediate between the developers and the community.

But the lessening of citizen participation shouldn't be misconstrued as meaning the diminishment of a watch on neighbourhood preservation. There still exists a vigilance on the part of residents which can be mobilized at a moments notice to block any unwanted change. Now, citizen participation focusses on a specific development proposal rather than on the future of an entire neighbourhood.

Todays community battles centre on the city's own social and housing policies. Residents seem to oppose city sponsored schemes as much as privately initiated ones. Residents now

gather to object to proposals for the construction of group homes and assisted housing. They oppose such developments for the very same reasons employed only a decade ago - disruption of the stable family oriented character of the neighbourhood, change in the social makeup of the population and protection of property values. The reform and routinization of neighbourhood planning has protected the interests of the middle class property owners but left others such as tenants, the poor, handicapped and minority groups shut out of the decision-making process as they were when the process started.

The incorporation of neighbourhood planning as an essential part of city planning is really a natural outcome of the growth of Toronto and indicates its elevation to a stage of maturity. This process occured in several cities in Canada which displayed similar growth pains more or less at the same time.

7 The Critique

Neighbourhood planning has led to several unforseen consequences. Many of the social goals of the protectionist planning policies have not been realized. City neighbourhoods have experienced significant social changes. In not acknowledging the social changes taking place, planning has not enabled our neighbourhoods to change organically in response to these pressures.

The 69 Plan had gone along with the market and tried to create conditions for dramatic change in Toronto to bring it up to so called modern standards. The planners of the day had failed to recognize that you can't handle vested interests in such a high handed manner, particularly when it comes to middle and upper class interests.

The response was to invent a planning process that worked for redevelopment in which the various intersts could be heard and in which compromises could be worked out. It resulted in a large expansion of the Planning budget, which was and continues to be well worth it. Once a community matures some form of meaningful mediation through planning is inevitable.

In the cities around Metro where they continually process plans for literally 100's of acres of new development each year, the planning staff often consists of 5 to 10 individuals. There are no vested interests. North York is at this moment just reaching the point in its history where it too is entering the troubled period of redevelopment. Inevitably they will have to develop some of the sensitivies which go along with redevelopment of their new downtown if they are not to bog down permanently in conflict.

But the reform movement did much more in Toronto than invent a new way of planning. It tried to halt change. It was successful in preventing physical change but could do nothing about the social change that was inevitable because it was occuring as a result of forces much more powerful than the

planning process. The lands under the inner neighbourhoods were potentially valuable due to their location irrespective of whether or not they were given additional development potential. Thus when the physical change option was denied and the security of the built form of those communities confirmed in the Plans which followed 1972, their transformation into middle and upper income communities happened fast, and is still happening. The market potential of those lands is being realized and the communities which were to be stabilized were destroyed by the market just as effectively, but with much less fuss, than they were by the developers. The land was reallocated to those who could pay the price for such now desirable locations.

The problem was the rationale used for the intervention. We said that it was necessary to save the communities. We did not say that we intended to preserve only the built form of the neighbourhoods. In the days of the late 60's and early 70's such social rationale was necessary, impotent as it was.

Also our understanding of the problem was wrong and today continues to prohibit change in our residential neighbourhoods. We intervened because we were losing important family housing in Toronto and we wished to restore the family base of our neighbourhoods. Why didn't we look at the population statistics. The fact is that we needed much less family housing and what was needed was housing for non-families. This continues to be the case.

The supply of family housing remains plentiful, and alway did, when considering Metro and its surrounding area. But more and more non-family people wanted to live in the centre of this major metropolis, and we denied them housing opportunities. In fact if one looks at the statistics it is plain to see that we were losing as many families in existing houses as we were through demolitions and whitepainting. Singles or childless couples have been taking over houses in all Toronto neighbourhoods over the last 15 years, and this social change has changed the face of our City forever. We did not need family housing, we always needed more apartments; affordable housing for both groups is always in short supply everywhere. There was no basis for shutting down the supply of apartments aimed at the private market for non-families other than issues of physical form. There are of course many alternatives to the high rise apartment tower and this has been demonstrated in a number of developments across this city by Cityhome.

One of the reasons for the continuing anti-development attitude at the community level in Toronto is that the reform movement created the impression that all the blame for the error of the past rested with the developers. The government and the planners were in it from the start but because we changed the faces involved these institutions were no longer to blame.

The developers are in fact ordinary business people. They always try to make as much money as they can, and they always ask for more than they can get. But its the planners/politicians/community who give it to them. What happened was that we came to see anything done by developers as bad because they profited from society's need. That may be a reasonable basis for making an evaluation, but not until Canada has a real socialist government.

The rules for development are the same as for any other industry, "make as much profit as you can and serve the market you choose to serve". Some developments make no social sense from the point of view of the City and never will, but they make a healthy buck for the developer; a 20 storey apartment tower in most neighbourhoods could be one of these. These should clearly be prohibited. Some developments make good sense from the point of view of the City but don't make any economic sense. These need to be stimulated with some type of incentive or the City might undertake them outside the market process, much like a Cityhome project. Some make good sense from both points of view. These should be allowed to happen irrespective of whether we think that super profits will flow.

As people concerned with how our cities function, and as planners and politicians, we need to satisfy ourselves as to what is best for the growth and development of our city in both physical and social terms, and forget about the profits.

It is my view that we threw out the baby with the bath water in 1972. We correctly rejected an unacceptable built form solution, expressways and urban renewal, but instead we created neighbourhood rigidity in place of organic growth and change. In reaction to dramatic and very negative changes which were proposed such as expressways and 20 storey apartment towers in our back yards we battened down the hatches and said nothing more is to change in the neighbourhoods. What remains to be done now is to pry open

the lid and begin to recognize some of the realities of our society in the 1980's.

7.1 Demographic Changes and Social Reality

Let us look at our city in real terms. Since the 1950's the population of Toronto has shrunk but the number of households has continued to grow, creating a continuing demand for more housing. Where does it come from. Well, in 1951 94% of our population was comprised of family households, by 1981 less than half at 48.9% were family households. This is not an isolated Toronto phenomenon due to the fact that our housing stock changed with the construction of apartments. No, its a phenomenon which has occurred through out our society. In the whole of Ontario family households grew by only 54% between 1951 and 1981, while the number of single person households grew by a dramatic 450%. [14]

Another way of looking at the same social changes is to consider the average household size. The average number of persons in a household in Toronto dropped from 4.3 in 1951 to only 2.4 in 1981; again it was not confined to Toronto as it dropped from 3.9 to 2.8 across all of Ontario in the same 30 year period. [15] It is clear to me that we need a very different housing stock today than we needed in this city just 30 years ago.

The age structure of the population has shifted during this period. The proportion of the population made up of children and teenagers has dropped significantly while those in their 20's and early 30's has increased. There is a decrease in the number of kids per family and most adult persons whether married or not are establishing their own households.

Household formation has virtually ceased to be synonymous with family formation. Toronto is becoming a city dominated by unattached individuals who live alone in non-family arrangements. The typical family which once occupied every neighbourhood house has disappeared from every second house. No longer do we find neighbourhoods populated by families with kids. Smaller households represent a rapidly growing sector of the city's population.

The considerable efforts made by communities, politicians and planners to maintain the stability of their neighbourhoods as we thought of them in the 50's and 60's are proving fruitless in the face of demographic changes taking place. These basic social forces are doing the real shaping of our city.

The total number of people within neighbourhoods is declining as the number of persons per household declines and new construction of housing in residential neighbourhoods is blocked. This means that neighbourhoods which once supported a certain population base on a given infrastructure of sewers, schools and police are now supporting smaller numbers of people without being able to reduce that infrastructure. Thus fewer people must carry the tax burden of operating and maintaining the infrastructure and municipal services. In fact, our neighbourhoods are able to support many more people than those who presently live here.

The forces which have produced the pressures for change of the present will continue in the future and cannot be avoided. Thus our neighbourhoods are not going to return to what they once were, instead they are gong to keep changing. We have clung too strongly to the need to physically protect our neighbourhoods and not permitted them to change organically. The neighbourhood planning philosophy is merely postponing the required organic changes while not impeding the social and economic changes from continuing.

7.2 Housing Crisis

The City of Toronto is becoming increasingly a preserve of the middle and upper classes, that may be an inevitable part of our market system. But, the aim of creating a balanced housing stock, the housing policy adopted by the city in the mid 1970's, has failed.

The City recognized that the private market would never provide housing for low and moderate income people in locations where the land could be allocated to more profitable uses. So instead they chose a non-market solution and said we will do it ourselves. The Cityhome program has been very successful in creating units for people in locations where the market would never allow them to be, at prices which they can afford. It is

the only way to defeat the market allocation system.

While the targets set for the provision of housing by the private sector have been surpassed in the form of luxury condominiums catering to the middle and upper classes, the provision of public assisted housing has lagged far behind the targets set by the city. A city planning report concludes, this shortfall is expected to get worse over time.[16] Assisted housing has only reached 50% of its overall target set by the city. Although Cityhome owns some 5,000 housing units and is presently the largest provider of new rental housing, the Cityhome housing stock represents only 3% of the rental stock of the city. In 1982, Cityhome had a waiting list of over 4,000 households and the planners now recognize that the assisted housing target will not be met.[17]

The problem is that non-market mechanisms are expensive and the City has not been able to convince the other levels of government who control the purse strings that their social justification of a mix of income groups in all areas of the city is justified. Many argue that a shelter allowance which will put money into the hands of people who need it is fairer. What they mean is it is fairer in terms of the allocation system. Then those who can only afford a little will be allocated the cheapest and least desirable locations via the market.

The modifications to the program under which Cityhome must operate which appeared some years back and which tie the assisted project to the low end of market have already had the effect of placing the best locations out of the reach of the City's program. So the city now finds itself the owner of some fine sites which it secured through trade-offs with developers in return for concessions and on which it can't build housing even if there were unit allocations. What is on the horizon is a Cityhome program even more closely tied to a market allocation system, in which the City will sell its expensive sites and then build in the cheaper areas. This will of course defeat the social objective of mix, which started the whole process, but still continue the provision of housing for low and moderate income people.

Like urban renewal which started out as a social housing program, the Cityhome program is in danger of running into the same problem. If it becomes a provider of housing in the already lower income and less desirable neighbourhoods, it is likely to be seen as exacerbating social problems. The goal

which started with salvaging the inner city social communities, which could only be achieved in a very limited scale but quite successfully by Cityhome, could become an instrument which will lead increasingly to conflict by concentrating low income people.

The City's chief housing objective of maintaining the diversity of its social fabric is not being met. A growing proportion of the city's housing is being occupied by middle and upper income people. This is reflected by the construction of large numbers of condominiums and the process of whitepainting taking place in the city's residential neighbourhoods. Planners now recognize the influence of market pressures and their tendency to reinforce social stratification. The naivety of the planners in thinking they could effect change has given way to the conclusion that their plans were too optimistic and that eventually, the City may take the form of an affluent central city surrounded by poorer suburbs. [18]

The housing policies and programs of the city have proven to have little effect in achieving its housing objectives. As a recent city planning report observed, the housing conditions for many residents in need have become worse over the years. It describes the housing situation as a crisis. [19]

This would not be important had not the City determined that it had a serious responsibility for housing, and for the price, distribution and so on of housing. The contradiction is that the policies followed in the past few years have added to the social stratification and reduced the production of apartment developments such as the infamous St. Jamestown, which now contains one of the largest components of affordable housing close to the centre, whatever one may think of its physical form.

The housing policy was based on a mispremise that housing was mainly needed for families with kids. The demographic changes indicate that perhaps the housing goals of the 69 Official Plan were more correct. Having re-evaluated the situation, it is now clear that there is a demand for smaller rental housing units.

The present housing problems are also made worse by the prohibition of most forms of incremental change to the existing housing stock in the city's zoning by-laws. A City housing task force report concluded recently, some of the land use regulations have had a discouraging effect on the intensification

of land use in neighbourhoods and of the housing stock.[20] The report concludes that a softening of the city's planning-zoning regulations may promote the development of more rental units in existing homes.

Aside from Cityhome, the City has done little to address the situation of housing need. The Task Force just mentioned tried to promote legislation which would allow a small measure of neighbourhood change through creating conditions for the conversion of existing houses in some neighbourhoods. Not of course in the wealthy ones with the large houses and the fewest people. This could have produced more units in existing homes. Now almost two years later the by-laws remain stuck somewhere without political support.

Reflecting on the turbulent reform years, we can feel reassured that the efforts to preserve the city and its neighbourhoods has resulted in an excellent physical city. We said we would preserve neighbourhoods, and we did save the physical neighbourhoods. Given our understanding of the land market, this was all we really could save. Was it worth it? Perhaps it was. In retrospect, some may feel that while the apartment redevelopment schemes were an undesirable form of physical change, they did provide a much needed source of housing.

Cityhome has an important lesson for the future. Virtually every Cityhome project has had to face the test of building an efficient development in the context of current market construction cost and conditions. The greatest proportion of the projects which have been built are considerably denser than would be permitted under the regulations which exist in most neighbourhoods. In fact, as we all know assisted housing is afforded a bonus under the current planning legislation. The justification for exemptions to the planning legislation for a neighbourhood are usually based upon social need. The public developer has managed to get away with things that a private developer could never hope to achieve today.

It is my view that in the type of project which Cityhome has managed to negotiate with the community in many neighbourhoods lies an answer for change in the future. Perhaps we didn't need to shut the lid so tight in 1972. Instead, we might have said no to high rise and still said that we will seriously consider some intermediate form of housing; just like Cityhome.

7.3 Industrial Policy

Notwithstanding the city's industrial policy and initiatives, industries continue to leave Toronto although not as fast. Manufacturing provided 12% of employment in the city in 1982, which is less than half what it used to be thirty years ago.[21] As a recent report commissioned by the city has found, few manufacturing firms are coming, starting up or expanding in the city.[22] Over the long term, the report found that manufacturing firms will continue to leave unless strong measures such as direct government subsidies are provided, and even then such actions will only keep the outflow to a minimum.

Although the objective of retaining industry is a laudable one, it goes against the reality of the land market. The city's industrial policy is based on social objectives which are not accounted for in the working of the land market. By preserving the industrial designation on this land, the city is artificially keeping land values down. But in view of the location pressures, speculation is occuring in industrial areas like King-Spadina. Illegal conversion of industrial sites to other uses is also taking place. As the recent study on industry has found, where re-use to more profitable uses are not permitted, the industrial sites could be abandoned and degenerate into "industrial slums".[23]

The economic reality is that it is not feasible for industry to remain in the inner city and for industrial areas to remain unchanged. Not because industries don't want to stay but because they can't pay the price. Inner City industry today is like the old inner city residential neighbourhoods in the second half of the 60's. The goals of industrial protection are commendable but land values in the city have risen beyond what industry can support. Strong pressures exist to change to office and housing development in areas like King-Spadina.

The city's policy of maintaining the industrial zoning and encouraging the preservation of industry has not, nor can it, succeed in steming the outflow of industry. It has however, blocked the regeneration and conversion of these areas to more profitable uses. At the same time, speculation continues. If improvements are not made to the old industrial buildings they

may go empty and run down. In the end, the economic forces will be too strong and as everyone knows and expects, economic forces will win out.

The answer is clear. The route of stopping change through the planning process is doomed to failure, it provides only a temporary respite. The alternative which the city seems to be leading to is to undertake direct non-market intervention like the Cityhome case. This route is likely as in the Cityhome case to be successful, but limited.

However, an opportunity is being lost, and that is much more important. In refusing to recognize the pressures for change in those areas, even in conjunction with direct intervention, the City is again allowing the market to plan by default. The pressures will build and bit by bit other uses will enter these industrial areas and change them gradually. Then the City will have to accept what has happened.

I want to make it quite clear that I am not saying that market forces know what is best for our Cities and that we should simply follow the direction in which the market appears to be leading us. I am saying that we ignore the general direction of market pressure at our peril. I have indicated that the inner residential neighbourhoods could have been redeveloped for high rise or been whitepainted, both are consistant with market forces. That is the type of determination which the planning process is able to make, and it is rather significant. What planning cannot do is to save the industries, just as it couldn't save the low income communities.

It is my view that the City now has the opportunity to think through creative solutions to the development of the industrial areas, which would vary one from the other. In some it may be to allocate the land for housing and a small amount of commercial, which would reflect the market potential admirably, though not necessarily the desires of the land owners, but might be a good solution for the City as a whole. Some less close to the centre might remain entirely industrial. Others may contain a mix of uses including industry based on an incentive system. I don't yet know the answers.

To conclude let me restate my analytic framework:

1. The major social and economic forces shape the city, not the planner or the politicians.

2. The land market does most of the real shaping, its the fundamental institution which dictates the overall urban form in our cities.

3. Redevelopment is not like new development it needs a different type of planning process than does new development. In Toronto we seem to have developed a planning process which works just fine for redevelopment and its not too costly or inefficient, it is in fact quite practical and sensitive.

4. The planners don't have the considerable powers which both the right and the left accuse them of having from time to time.

5. Planning can shape the flow of change. It will be more effective if it is goes more or less in the same direction as the market and least effective if it opposes the flow. That means if trees and brick paving become a priority then we will have tree lined brick sidewalks alongside every new building, the issues of appearance, physical form and relationships between buildings are issues in which planning can have a large impact. They are important issues to our long term ability to enjoy the city.

6. To be effective in dealing with those issues (usually social) which run contrary to the market, the initiative occurs best outside the market, like Cityhome. In such cases the limitations and problems which might result should be clearly spelled out and understood, or the action will be discredited for not achieving more dramatic results. It is usally a question of political will. Metro recently offered the Dome $30 million, I am sure Cityhome could build a lot more housing without the other governmental levels for that kind of money.

mixed land use pattern.

4. Finally the social issues. I can't realistically see us doing much more than a Cityhome type of intervention and I certainly prefer such a clear and direct act to achieve a clearly defined goal. I can't see the general planning process doing much for social change through incentives and bonuses, through bullying and blackmail. In fact, I'm tired of using social justifications as an excuse for a physical development compromise where the two are entirely unrelated.

I'm sure you will have much more insightful things to say about the future in the following sessions and I look forward to hearing them.

Frank R. Lewinberg

September 1984

FOOTNOTES

1. City of Toronto Planning Board, Third Annual Report of the City Planning Board, Toronto, p.17.
2. Ibid. p.18
3. City of Toronto Planning Board, Urban Renewal: A Study of the City of Toronto, p.4.
4. Lemon, Toronto Since 1918: An Illustrated History, chap. 4.
5. City of Toronto Planning Board, Proposed Plan for Toronto, p. 22.
6. Ibid. p.23.
7. Ibid. p.24.
8. Goldrick, "The Anatomy of Urban Reform in Toronto", p. 34.
9. City of Toronto Planning Board, Living Room. p.15.
10. Sewell, Up Against City Hall, p.88.
11. City of Toronto Planning Board, A Place for Industry, p.2.
12. Ibid. p.4.
13. City of Toronto Planning Board, Living Room, p.19.
14. Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing and Association of Municipalities of Ontario, Study of Residential Intensification and Rental Housing Conservation, vol. 2.
15. ibid, vol. 2.
16. City of Toronto Planning and Development Department, Confronting the Crisis. p.34.
17. Ibid. p.38.
18. Ibid. p.21.
19. Ibid. p.2.

20. Interdepartmental Task Force on Affordable Housing, "The More Efficient Residential Use of Properties in the City, Including the Promotion of More Affordable Housing". pp.19-21.

21. Ibid. p.2, 5.

22. Woods Gordon, City of Toronto: A Review of the Proposed Economic Development Corporation, p.12.

23. Ibid. p.14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Grant. "Local Area Planning: The dream and the reality." City Magazine 2 (March 1977):35-43.

Blumenfeld, Hans. "Mismatch between size of households and of dwelling units." City Magazine 6 (April 1984):28-32.

Bryan, John. "What have the planners been doing?" City Planning (Spring 1984):34-36.

Bryant, Pamela. "Toronto's Official Plan: Some Lessons for Neighborhood Planning." In Case Studies of Neighborhood Planning in Toronto, edited by John Hitchcock. Toronto: Urban and Regional Planning Department, University of Toronto, Papers on Planning and Design, No. 1, December 1973.

Bureau Of Municipal Research. Neighborhood Participation in Local Government: A Study of the City Of Toronto. Toronto: Civic Affairs, January 1970.

Caulfield, Jon. The Tiny Perfect Mayor. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, 1974.

Chorney, Harold. "The Decline of Neighborhood and The Rise of Social Services." City Magazine 6 (April 1984):24-27.

City of Toronto Housing Department. Building Challenges: 1981 Annual Report of the City of Toronto Housing Department. 1981.

City of Toronto Housing Department. Shifting Foundations: 1982 Annual Report of the City of Toronto Housing Department. 1982.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. Confronting the Crisis: A Review of City Housing Policy 1976-1981. January 1982.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. "Discussion Paper On Public Participation in Planning". January 18, 1982.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Industrial Policy and the Central Industrial District. February 1978.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Industrial Zoning: Final Recommendations. February 1978.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Living Room: An Approach to Home Banking and Land Banking For the City of Toronto. Housing Work Group. December 1973.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Neighborhood Plan Proposals: Annex. October 1978.

City of Toronto Planning Board. A Place For Industry. Industry Work Group. June 1974.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Proposals: Central Area Plan Review Part 1: General Plan. October 1975.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Proposed Plan For Toronto. June 1967.

City of Toronto Planning Board. South-East Spadina: Final Recommendations. 1979.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Third Annual Report of the City Planning Board Toronto. December 30, 1944.

City of Toronto Planning Board. The Trefann Court Urban Renewal Scheme. January 1972.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Urban Renewal: A Study of the City of Toronto. 1956.

Dowler, Craig. "Two Approaches To Neighborhood Planning In Toronto". In Case Studies of Neighborhood Planning in Toronto, edited by John Hitchcock. Toronto: Urban and Regional Planning Department, University of Toronto, Papers on Planning and Design, No. 1, December 1973.

Frisken, Frances. ed. Urban Growth and Community Needs. Toronto: Urban Studies Program, York University, February 1973.

Fraser, Graham. Fighting Back: Urban Renewal in Trefann Court. Toronto: Hakkert, 1972.

Goldrick, Michael. "The Anatomy of Urban Reform in Toronto." City Magazine 3(May/June 1978):29-39.

Granatstein, J.L. Marlborough Marathon. Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1971.

Hitchcock, John. ed. Case Studies of Neighborhood Planning In Toronto. Toronto: Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto, Papers on Planning and Design, No. 1, December 1973.

Hitchcock, John and Bellamy, Donald. "Neighborhood Planning and Neighborhood Practice". Plan Canada 17/2(June 1977):96-106.

Interdepartmental Task Force on Affordable Housing. "The More Efficient Residential Use of Properties in the City, Including the Promotion of More Affordable Housing". Toronto: City of Toronto, September 24, 1982.

Keating, Donald. The Power to Make It Happen. Toronto: Green Tree Publishing Co., 1975.

Laver, Ross. "Battles seem all in the past for Toronto's citizen-activists." Globe and Mail, August 14, 1982, p. 1,4.

Lemon, James. "Toronto: Is it a model for urban life and citizen participation". In Community Participation and the Spatial Order of the City, edited by David Ley. Vancouver: B.C. Geographical Series, No. 19, Tantalus Limited, 1974.

Lemon, James. Toronto Since 1918: An Illustrated History. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company and National Museum of Man, 1984, forthcoming, November.

Ley, David. ed. Community Participation and the Spatial Order of the City. Vancouver: B.C. Geographical Series, No. 19, Tantalus Limited, 1974.

Ley, David. "The Neighborhood Movement In A Canadian City". Urban Resources, University of Cincinnati 1 (Winter 1984):23-26.

Lorimer, James. A Citizen's Guide to City Politics. Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1972.

Lorimer, James. The Real World of City Politics. Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1970.

Morley, David and Burton, Lydia. "Reflecting On Neighborhood Futures: A Toronto Example." Urban Resources, University of Cincinnati 1 (Winter 1984):7-14.

Raby, Catherine. "After Two Years Of Chaos, Cityhome Still Struggling." Real Estate News 3 (October 9, 1981).

Rose, Albert. Prospects For Rehabilitation Of Housing in Central Toronto. City of Toronto Planning Board, September 1966.

Rowlands, June. "Housing the Poor." In Urban Growth and Community Needs, edited by Frances Frisken. Toronto: Urban Studies Program, York University, February 1973.

Salamon, Nimrod. "The Changes of an Inner-City Neighborhood: A Case Study of The Grange." Major Paper, Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, 1982.

Sewell, John. Up Against City Hall. Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1972.

Sewell, John. "What's happening downtown? I. 45-foot history." Toronto News 1 (October 1, 1975).

Siggins, Maggie. "Unforeseen Developments". Toronto Life (January 1982):13-18.

Stein, David Lewis. Toronto For Sale. Toronto: New Press, 1972.

Wilson, James. "Planners In The Middle: Survival strategies for the storefront planner". Plan Canada 22 (3/4):75-85.

Woods Gordon. City of Toronto: A Review Of The Proposed Economic Development Corporation. May 1984.

IF THE RULES CHANGE, HOW WILL TORONTO NEIGHBOURHOODS BENEFIT?

RYERSON SCHOOL OF URBAN & REGIONAL PLANNING

Larry Sherman, Chairman

Mitchell Kosny, PhD

Joseph Springer, PhD

Prepared for delivery at the

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING CONFERENCE

TORONTO, ONTARIO

NOVEMBER 16-17, 1984

IF THE RULES CHANGE, HOW WILL TORONTO NEIGHBOURHOODS BENEFIT?

I. WHY ASK THE QUESTION?

A key function of planning is to reduce the incidence of negative impacts that result from change. Public response to change can range from eager anticipation to fear and/or anger based in large part on the type and extent of change anticipated. A conference on the future of neighbourhood planning is an ideal forum in which to examine the possible impacts of future change.

We must be challenged to think about change incrementally and at the same time think in quantum leaps into the future. We must think about the incremental changes which will likely occur within the present-day context while at the same time think about the implications of factors which would dramatically change that context. In short, we must also think about futures in which the rules by which we live in neighbourhoods and develop them are changed.

To question the future of Toronto neighbourhoods requires certain observations about the recent past and where we are now:

- The impact of planning in Toronto should be understood in terms of what was done and what was prevented from being done; the history of Toronto neighbourhoods is the result of both development and prevention. For example, while apartment towers mark Bloor Street at Quebec/Gothic, similar developments were approved and then defeated at many similar sites; we got the CN Tower but not Metro Centre; we have an Allen Road but not a Spadina Expressway.

- Economic conditions of the 1970-1980 period will not be replicated in the near future. Low growth, or no growth has replaced the explosive expansion period of the late 1960's and through the 70's.

- The structure of the Canadian development industry has become 'world class'. Successful Canadian developers are now multi-nationals with resources measured in the billions of dollars supported by Canada's largest banks.

- Yet the focus, scale, and location of development has more recently shifted as a result of the slower economy. There is no longer the large scale public as well as private sector development at the local level we experienced in the 70's.

- Neighbourhood leadership has matured during the 70's. This maturity will be increasingly tested as the relationship between local governments and residents, for the first time in Canada, is subjected to much closer judicial scrutiny based new constitutional grounds.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the implications of such change factors for Toronto neighbourhoods over the next decade and to postulate possible scenarios which may well characterize these neighbourhoods in the future. We invite the Conference to do the same. Perhaps the most significant impact of this Conference can be to share a critical look into possible futures for Toronto neighbourhoods and to examine just how they might benefit. We may discover that the prospects of change are not so bad after all, and then again, we may re-discover that change is not necessarily equal to progress.

II. FOUR MAJOR CHANGE FACTORS WE HAD BETTER PLAN FOR

1. The Flat Economy

Neighbourhood planning in the 1970's flowered in the heady days of economic growth. While this growth meant more and better housing for many people, it also meant that neighbourhoods were threatened on all sides by the powerful influence of big money investment. Because the stakes were high for both developers and neighbourhoods, planners flourished in the business of conflict resolution.

As local homeowners fought to preserve the physical and social character of their neighbourhood, they also profited.

Resistance to development and higher densities worked to hold supply down relative to increasing demand and, consequently, those neighourhoods enjoyed monumental increases in their own value to the further satisfaction of those who fought new development for all the 'right reasons'.

In some cases, developers joined forces with homeowners in white-painting, infilling and subdividing existing buildings to transform old neighbourhoods into new [e.g., the 'miracle of Cabbagetown']. In most cases, the bouyancy of the economy brought profit to most developers and homeowners alike. There surfaced a bit of real estate speculator in all of us. It was indeed the favourite backyard barbeque topic of the 70's.

Now we are told that while the demand for social services continues to increase, the economy is not expected to grow at the same pace and is actually expected to result in real income declines for both individuals and the municipal tax base. Effective neighbourhood energies may now turn from fighting development investment in the next ten years to fighting one another for the benefits of that elusive economic growth necessary to fund required services and infra-structure development.

Scarcities can bring out the worst in us even at the neighbourhood level. Government funding agencies and municipal councils will increasingly be called to account for how the scarce economic pie is to be divided between neighbourhoods. Without the common enemy, neighbourhoods may turn on one another and look to the traditional security blankets of relative power, wealth, and legal exclusivity with everything they have to muster from formal zoning by-laws to informal political influence.

If we are subjected to a decade of flat economics, the greatest social danger may be a forcing of the poor from the cities to the suburbs, away from central city services, amenities, jobs and housing. While our society has generally protected itself in law against such biases as colour, age, sex and ethnic origin, our bias toward wealth is a matter of long standing tradition. There is the danger that in tough economic times neighbourhoods can employ discretionary zoning to protect themselves from the perceived disadvantages of having poor people as neighbours. In the boom times of the 70's, we invented zero lot line and stacked townhouses and we converted mansions to apartment complexes in order to house the affluent. In poor economic times, we may look to the same controls to ensure against those who cannot afford minimum lot sizes and frontages, brick facades, off-street covered parking, and the luxury of not having to carry out one's business in the home.

The boom years of the 70's produced in Canada an incredibly strong land development industry which achieved both wealth and an unprecedented capacity to develop large scale projects. For some there was the promise that this expertise and wealth would somehow be re-invested in a supply of affordable housing as well as luxury market housing in Canada. However, with the flat economic times of the 80's we discover that this expertise and wealth has instead been withdrawn to greener pastures south of the border. Nearly all of the major Canadian developers and many Canadian banks are investing heavily in New York, Dallas, Houston San Francisco, Los Angeles et al while withdrawing, often totally, from the Canadian housing market.

The result in the 1980's is a dramatic shifting of gears, even to the extent of the primary purpose of building housing at all. The massive speculative investment of the 70's has been replaced by a more modest interest in building barely enough additional units in Canada to meet the current much reduced affordable housing demand. Because there is less ability to spend for housing, the need is much greater than the number of units which the market seems to be demanding.

This dramatic change of gears will not only be seen in terms of the scale and price of housing produced, but also in the form. Adding the ancillary unit, infilling subdivisions of larger lots, renovating older buildings instead of building new - these will be the hallmarks of the 80's.

In summary, the flat economy, the even flatter anticipated housing market, and the resulting decrease in the investment motivation, spells a decade of housing market predictability that should contribute to neighbourhood stability [if you are an optimist] or stagnation [if you are a pessimist].

2. Demographic Shifts

Demographers seem to agree that Toronto's population over the next ten years will be generally characterized by at least two significant continuing trends, aging and social diversity.

The increasing diversity of Toronto's households is perhaps the more dramatic and graphic, the result of first generation immigration from countries throughout the world, and of trends in a variety of household definitions which now include unmarried couples with and without children, single parent families, gay couples, teenage couples, elderly couples, disabled couples, retarded couples, group living arrangements and, of course,

single persons of all kinds. Overlay these household types with traditional variables of ethnic origin, age, income and family size and one can readily imagine the potential social diversity which many of Toronto's neighbourhoods will experience in the next decade.

This suggests an increasingly diverse housing demand emerging in terms of unit size, form, price and location throughout the city. Since most Toronto neighbourhoods offer a reasonable range of unit types and sizes, one cannot predict with much confidence those neighbourhoods which will not be affected by this social diversity over the next ten years.

This raises the question of neighbourhood 'stability'. Will neighbourhoods enjoying some degree of homogeneity today become apprehensive about the prospects of social diversity and seek protective restrictions, or will such diversity actually provide the stability desired because people will have no reason to fear and resist heterogeneity since it will have already happened to them?

The fact that Toronto's population is aging is perhaps more subtle but just as significant for neighbourhoods in the next decade. As people age, they tend to prefer more the perceived comforts of homogeneity. They often find age, income and ethnic mix to be disquieting, yet the housing stock in their neighbourhoods may very well appeal to younger families and so diversity may be forced upon them. We must thoroughly consider the implications of homogeneity for the aged [peace and quiet or isolation?] vs. heterogeneity in neighbourhoods [stimulating social interaction or loneliness?]. All the plans and zoning by-laws in the world will not substitute for thoughtful resolution of the quality of neighbourhood life which must be achieved for the aging populations of Toronto.

3. Information Technology

It is by now a common cliche that the micro chip has revolutionized our lives by instantaneously collecting, storing and accessing vast amounts of information critical to our daily lives . . . except perhaps if we are neighbourhood citizens looking to influence a planning decision under consideration at City Hall.

While the City of Toronto boasts of having developed one of the most sophisticated computer-based information management systems of any city hall in North America, this information remains beyond the domain of most neighbourhood interest groups.

Certaninly most banks and developers have similar aids, but we have yet to see the day when this technology is organized as a system to provide a common base of information with which to assist the various neighbourhood interests in examining the overall implications of any particular planning issue or development proposal.

Imagine, if you will, the day when the Planner calls to his his office the various people concerned with tearing down that old three-storey school and replacing it with this forty-eight storey glass and balcony tower. Coffee is served to all - the developer, the local aldermen, the City's Commissioners of Finance and Public Works, representatives of the Historical Board, the Tenants' Rights Association, the Mayor's office and, of course, the Neighbourhood Residents' Association.

The developer's architect makes the slide presentation complete with coloured perspectives and a model of the proposed building. Then comes the questions: how much traffic? who pays for what? what about the shadows cast on neighbours? what's the impact on the tax base and the schools? why not make it twenty-four stories instead of forty-eight? how about two smaller buildings instead of one tall one?

Instead of our planner negotiating for a four-week hiatus while everyone goes away to answer these questions, he flicks on his computer terminal and calls up a pre-programmed three-dimensional image of the existing block in question, together with its surroundings. He then wipes out the existing three-storey school building and replaces it with an image of the proposed building envelope. Systematically each question is then examined. Sure enough, the site lines in the architect's drawing are not quite accurate, the shadows are longer, the public cost estimate is higher. Some alternatives are examined. More coffee is poured. Those alternatives turn out to be more costly, driving up the rents that would justify the project. The neighbours are not willing to accept an empty school building either. A compromise is suggested. The architect describes a building envelope which might work. It tests out. The developer says it's financially viable. Everyone smiles [at least to themelves]. The planner invites everyone to lunch.

This over-simplistic [perhaps overly optimistic] scenario is only meant to suggest that we should look forward to applying information technology to assisting the planning process and the dialogue between interests which focus on planning issues, and we should look forward, as well, to neighbourhoods gaining equal access to that technology.

Assuming this is achieved, certain questions are raised:

- The ethics of public access to such information is a long-standing government concern, but it cannot continue to be the impediment; acceptable, flexible guidelines will be required and government should get on with finding them.

- As well, guidelines for the use [and to guard against the misuse] of the information must be established. This will require planners to clearly define within the process where such information technologies are to be employed.

- Facts do not speak for themselves and there is no technological substitute for thoughtful analysis and common sense conclusions. The prescribed process must require that the participants in the dialogue ultimately commit themselves to conclusions based on their convictions and values and not hide behind 'the facts'.

4. Judicial Scrutiny

Ontario's planning, especially in Toronto, has flourished over the past decade within an environment that allows substantial administrative discretion. This has allowed the subdivision approval process to become a forum in which participants bargain for the right to obtain benefits. Official plans, based on vague goals, were designed in a manner that forced developers to the bargaining table. Once there, they find the municipality uses its broad administrative powers to exact costly concessions which translate into public amenities, urban design, infrastructure improvements and cash levies.

If not settled at the bargaining table, the dispute is settled at the Ontario Municipal Board which functions relatively free of the normal constraints of judiciary precedent. However, in 1985, Section 15 of the new Canadian Charter of Rights comes into effect, providing the right of "equal protection" under the laws of the land. The imposition of equal protection under the new Constitution will create substantial changes to the traditional process of planning controls and development approvals:

[a] The principle of parliamentary supremacy which previously allowed provincial and

municipal legislators the "presumption of validity" will be removed. This means that courts will now be given the constitutional jurisdiction to scrutinize legislation for the existence of procedural and substantive safeguards that due process and equal protection offer the individual.

Municipalities will be required to draft their by-laws and implement them with due regard to these protections based on Section 32[1]b of the Charter.

[b] The new Charter of Rights will affect planning in several additional, more specific areas including: [i] Zoning [especially spot zoning, exclusionary zoning and de facto taking]; [ii] Subdivision Controls [dedication and development charges and lot fees]; [iii] Moratoria and Interim Controls [provision of services, staging, and other forms of growth management]; [iv] Land Use Controls [restrictions on architectural design and other aesthetic factors related to freedom of expression].

[c] The courts will join the Ontario Municipal Board as a vehicle in which an individual may seek redress but based on the constitutional protections offered by the Charter. This is sure to place the courts and the OMB in conflict from time to time.

[d] The power of the OMB will change. Those requests that have a basis in the constitution may go directly to the courts, bypassing the OMB. This may limit the OMB's effectiveness or jurisdiction in some areas, but may broaden it in other non-charter areas.

[e] The courts will have to define new standards for weighing government interests against those protecting the individual within the Constitution. The decision not to protect property explicity within the Constitution has, in fact, complicated the task of judicial scrutiny by forcing lawyers and the courts to use more indirect methods of protecting property such as the principle of equal protection. The basis of judicial review is thus broader and the standards set will be more complex and less generally applicabl This can lead to more complex litigation at the local level.

[f] The ability of local politicians to respond to individual pressure groups, ratepayer associations, and other neighbourhood based interest groups will be limited by the existence of judicial scrutiny and the need to ensure equal treatment of and before the law.

The issue of judicial scrutiny in planning will be inescapable. It will undoubtedly create clashes between the Charter however it is interpreted, and the Planning Act however it may be amended.

III. THE NEXT DECADE OF CHANGE:NEIGHBOURHOODS COULD WIN OR LOSE

Envision the City of Toronto in 1994 made up of neighbourhoods functioning in the context of these change factors: a slow/no growth economy; a much more diverse population; ready access to extensive data; and the rights of ownership and use of real property interpreted by the courts instead of by municipal and provincial officials.

This future could be good news for neighbourhoods and, then again, it could be bad news. Who is to benefit and who is to pay? What are the costs and what might be the trade-offs?

First let us consider a scenario in which neighbourhoods seem to benefit, become more self-determining and stable, more active partners in the decision-making process and, in turn, potentially more responsive to the needs and desires of their residents. Let us assume that in the next decade change means a more diversified social mix, more integration within neighbourhoods, better protection under the law, and greater access to the primary data.

One might argue that if the final appeal with regard to land use rights shifts from Cabinet to the courts, thus effectively relieving Cabinet of some of its real authority, the Provincial Government may be more ready to pass on some of its responsibilities [and authorities] to city councils. After all, the argument goes, if there is someone up there who can contradict you, and likely will at least until things settle down, why take the public flack when it can be passed on down. This logic may may make sense to municipal politicians as well and, under pressure from local constituencies, one might even imagine the day when neighbourhoods are deligated the power to allocate funds and decide upon development and services affecting their own areas.

However, while a more diverse society creates more demand for a wider range of services, a flat economy will generate less supply of local tax monies to pay for those services. Competition between neighbourhoods for slices of the public pie will increase. Enterprising neighbourhoods will be able to compete in the private sector for development [rather than attempt to restrict it as in the past] and will become more creative about how their services might more efficiently be provided.

Neighbourhoods with the ability to stimulate the development of their own local services may look more to the private sector for the provision of those services. Indeed, it may become unconstitutional to prohibit a proliferation of social services in the private and/or institutional sectors and neighbourhoods could discover a right to privatise. This may make such good economic sense that even local governments begin to encourage a degree of privatisation to reduce costly public service responsibilities. Neighbourhoods may find the ability to purchase services to suit a variety of standards, such as garbage collection at the side of the house or at central collection points according to the particular neighbourhood's ability to pay, a social service delivered to the house or collectively offered at the community centre.

Neighbourhoods may even find that by owning property collectively, they can economize and at the same time obtain collective ownership rights in law, stimulating the growth of private and co-operative neighbourhoods among the not-so-rich. Might even neighbourhoods demand the right to be taxed in relation to the services they receive?

The result of all this is a vision of Toronto as a City of neighbourhoods of individual economic and social personalities each reflecting the choices of their residents. If neighbourhoods do obtain a greater measure of their own self-determination affecting strictly neighbourhood scale matters, Metro Government may also gain a greater responsibility for determining the regional scale matters of land use, movement, infrastructure, social services, and economic development. The role of the City will either be dissipated as neighbourhood and Metro roles expand, or there may be a new broker/referee role between the two according to the particular crystal ball you may have in hand.

Alternatively, neighbourhoods could lose a great deal of hard fought for ground. Consider another scenario:

- the present period of flat economic growth extends into the future with its attendant impacts on assessment and taxes;

- Toronto continues to attract a disproportionate share of the needy [the mentally, physically and economically disadvantaged and new Canadians] in addition to its own aging population;

- transfer payments from the Federal and Provincial levels for social services grow at a rate less than inflation and considerably less than need;

- as resources become more scarce, government increasingly tends to allocate its funds with more of a view to efficiency than equity;

- the court moves aggressively to perform its function of scrutinizing and interpreting the Charter, forcing municipalities to limit the use of administrative discretion. In the process, the use of sections of the Planning Act as a means of redistributing income from developers to local residents is reduced.

Under these conditions, communities realize that non-participation is tantamount to surrender and that any advantage must be used to 'protect' themselves. However, major distinctions that the courts have not considered inherently suspect are those based on wealth, and it is this type of distinction that functions in a severe economic environment to polarize communities. Attempts to safeguard individual safety, the quality of education, and the value of property at the neighbourhood level could result in:

- intolerance within the neighbourhoods of disadvantaged or dependent populations [group homes, etc.];

- opposition to the construction of lower income housing [for seniors, even];

- racial intolerance.

At the broader municipal level, the planning process becomes more piece-meal as the courts set out new guidelines for municipal planning, and this produces even more delays and confusion in the short term. The small local developers are unable to function in this environment because of the increased cost and uncertainty on the one hand, and the reduced profit opportunity on the other. However, the large multi-national companies have a choice of countries in which to invest and an unstable Toronto is low on their list. The new system discriminates against the small developer without attracting the large ones.

Overall, communities in this scenario become more homogeneous, less tolerant, and more isolated from each other with sharply defined edges that are characterized by conflict. The struggle for power deteriorates into an unequal battle between the 'haves' and 'have-nots' for, as one lawyer put it, justice is expensive.

This scenario is not without example elsewhere. We have only to look south of the border to school board decisions in California and New Jersey where the Supreme Court has failed to strike down the principle that distinctions between districts based on wealth are inappropriate; to exclusionary zoning decisions in New York, and to the ten-year battle that the Forest Hill community in New York City waged to finally prevent the construction of scattered site low-cost housing within its borders.

Closer to home Toronto's Planning Commissioner, in a speech to the Canadian Institute of Planners in September 1984, discussed how the present system of negotiation with developers puts the smaller developers who find it costly to meet city demands at a disadvantage.

There are interesting consistencies in both our scenarios that should be highlighted. We envision a city in which both the structure and role of neighbourhoods change dramatically. As well, we see the role of municipal governments changing in response to differing needs of the population and a difference in the way legislation to address those needs can be drafted and implemented. In short, we see the real difference between the benefits and the costs to neighbourhoods as a matter of degree rather than a fundamental redirection of government.

Fianlly, what would a planning conference be without questioning what the role of the planner will be in all this change? To envision, as many do, the future planner as arbiter or mediator suggests new skills, new attitudes about public involvement, and surely new challenges for how to contribute professional leadership, social responsibility and creativity.

If planners only mediate between the interests of others, who needs them? The Government of British Columbia recently decided to let the political and economic marketplace do the planning and so fired many provincial and regional planners. If we have a role, it will be the product of, in part, our very ability to ask these questions about the future of our neighbourhoods. If we find answers, it will be because our profession has seen fit to creatively search for them by inviting a broad and diverse range of interests and disciplines into the planning dialogue.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

Future Directions for Neighbourhood Planning

City of Toronto
Planning and Development Department
Stephen G. McLaughlin, Commissioner
November 1984

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING:

T H E C H A L L E N G E A H E A D

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department
Stephen G. McLaughlin, Commissioner

NOVEMBER, 1984

1. INTRODUCTION

When visitors are asked about Toronto they talk first about how clean the subway is, that it is possible to walk the streets at night, that Torontonians are a pretty reserved bunch and that our liquor laws are still a bit peculiar. Next they expound on how they bought an Indian silk shirt at Gerrard Square, wandered among the geese and the chickens of Kensington Market, took a long streetcar ride to the Beaches and finished the day in an authentic Greek restaurant on the Danforth. They then express surprise about how many different neighbourhoods can be discovered in Toronto. Toronto has always been a city of neighbourhoods. It grew by annexing neighbouring hamlets, villages and towns. Their names are still with us, conjuring up a certain flavour, a special identity: Brockton, Davenport, Carleton, Yorkville, Parkdale, West Toronto Junction.

Over its history, Toronto's neighbourhoods have undergone tremendous changes, frequently accompanied by great social upheaval. Some have been destroyed and rebuilt, others have managed to adapt their physical forms to the ever-changing demands of successive population groups.

Today, Toronto's residents still identify very strongly with the geographic location of their neighbourhoods, with their pools and parks and other community services. They rise up in protest when their local school is threatened with closure because of declining enrolment. Neighbourhoods are important to them, because they provide a sense of belonging and of cultural identification. They are places to raise a family or live alone or in groups. Conformity is not a requirement.

This is a good time to take a look at Toronto's neighbourhoods. The City's population has been declining. The number of single parents and senior citizens is climbing and there seems to be an influx of people who, for one reason or another, need many more support services. Unemployment is becoming a serious problem. The Metro Toronto rental vacancy rate stands at less than 1% and there is virtually no new housing being built that is within a reasonable price range. In the current climate of economic restraint, many needed services cannot be provided or expanded. On the other hand, large amounts of public funds are allocated to new transit technology, the downtown convention centre, the domed stadium and the ever increasing Go-train commuter network.

In this context certain questions become unavoidable. Can the City respond to the growing demands for more services at a time of shrinking financial resources? How can neighbourhood needs and the central core's appetite for public funds be reconciled? Will

the City be able to maintain its service standards across the board? These are questions that must be dealt with in the coming years. Clearly, there are tough choices to be made.

Neighbourhood planning has a commitment to neighbourhood preservation that goes beyond just retaining the physical shape. While maintaining a pleasant streetscape, protecting ravines or saving Victorian buildings are all important, it is equally important that Toronto neighbourhoods continue to accommodate the large variety of people that want to live here.

To discuss possible options for neighbourhood planning, the City of Toronto has to be seen in context. In Ontario, municipalities are creatures of the Province with limited responsibilities delegated to them by the senior levels of government. All municipalities, large or small, have to operate under the same general legislation. There are few concessions to differences of scale, complexity of the problems or administrative ability to respond.

In addition to these constitutional and political limitations, there are larger social, economic and cultural forces which are at work quite beyond the City's control. Toronto's ethnic communities have little say in federal immigration policy or in decisions shaping Canada's role in international affairs. Yet neighbourhood businesses, cultural traditions and community institutions are greatly affected by these policies. Neighbourhood businesses do not influence market conditions, government monetary and trade policies or industrial strategies. But the effects of changes in any of these areas on local companies are felt first by their neighbourhoods. The federal government alternately encourages or slows the supply of new housing, and local housing producers have to adapt accordingly.

Most social problems in Toronto manifest themselves at the neighbourhood and community levels, and often, this is where innovative solutions are developed. Growing racial tension in the City has caused a Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations to be established. Its subcommittee on policing has been instrumental in improving police-community relations.

Occasionally, solutions found locally are sanctioned by senior levels of government through the creation of a new program, incorporation into general legislation or amendments to the City of Toronto Act. The Ontario Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme (RRAP) grew from a concern for Toronto's rapidly deteriorating housing stock. People on low and fixed incomes needed financial help to make the basic renovations required to keep their houses structurally sound. When the City became concerned about increasing numbers of houses being torn down and not being replaced, it requested and was granted residential demolition control powers through special legislation. A recent

new CMHC programme is aimed at providing minimum standard, basic housing for low income single people, in direct response to recommendations put forward by the City and Metro levels of government.

Thus, while many of the emerging trends may suggest a bleak future for the City of Toronto, not all are irreversible. On the contrary, a number of them pose exciting challenges to neighbourhood planning.

After all, the profession's central stock-in-trade is land use planning with all its inherent limitations. Only secondarily do most planners deal with social policy issues or direct service delivery. Yet the effects of demographic change, for example, are ultimately reflected at the level of land use. The demand for affordable housing resulted in widespread illegal house conversions in Parkdale and the Annex. A drastic reduction in disposable income in a neighbourhood may cause businesses to fail, contributing to the eventual decline of the local commercial strip. An economic recovery on the other hand, usually means increased building activity, more jobs and general prosperity that enables people to invest in home improvements.

The question, then, centres on what kind of city of the future we, from a neighbourhood planning point of view, want to see and want to help shape. Since planners work within a political context and are limited by legislation, available neighbourhood planning tools and methods will have to be used to the best possible effect.

With this goal in mind we will begin the discussion by outlining a vision of a future Toronto. We will then turn to the emerging trends that will likely affect progress towards realizing this ideal city of tomorrow. Based on the discussion of trends and the challenges inherent in them, we will attempt to define the past, present and future role of neighbourhood planning in the City of Toronto.

2. WHAT KIND OF CITY?

In spite of hours of discussion among various groups of experienced neighbourhood planners (or perhaps because of it), there was no agreement on a word that adequately characterizes the ideal version of tomorrow's City of Toronto. Liveable, healthy, safe, diversified, decent, equitable, just, are all adjectives which contain some of the components of what Toronto's neighbourhoods of the future should be. What do these words mean?

Liveable implies that people feel comfortable in their neighbourhoods, that local community facilities and services are adequate and easily accessible. It also means that the municipal infrastructure is in place, that basic services like public transit, water, sewers and electricity function well, that urban

problems like traffic congestion and industrial pollution remain manageable; that buildings and streetscapes are designed to reflect a human scale, so that they do not dwarf and overwhelm us.

The idea of healthy neighbourhoods presupposes well integrated communities full of vitality, with few signs of physical deterioration. Their social fabric is intact and they can respond with maturity and reason to whatever crisis arises .

The concept of a safe city, of safe neighbourhoods, carries with it the notion that it is possible to walk Toronto's streets at night; that women can go out on their own; that children need not fear abuse; that violent crime is rare; that vandalism and minor felonies are kept in check; that we can rely on receiving a continuously high standard of fire and police protection; that sanitation and public health services are well supported and of a high quality.

Although liveable, healthy and safe neighbourhoods are important to tomorrow's Toronto, one of neighbourhood planning's central goals is to maintain and enhance neighbourhood diversity. We are interested in encouraging a mixture of land uses that can co-exist without infringing upon one another to maintain a diversified job and tax base. In this idealized vision, Toronto's neighbourhoods offer a wide variety of choices: a choice for people of all ages and incomes and from all parts of the world to live here; a choice among a multitude of housing types; a choice of the kind of living arrangement suited to each individual or family; a choice of whether simply to live in a neighbourhood or whether also to work and play there. The diversity within and among neighbourhoods that results from this wide array of choices is expressed in the uses people make of local streets and other public spaces. It is evident in the tolerance they show towards people who are different and in the intensity and spontaneity of neighbourhood life.

Fundamental to the goal of neighbourhood diversity is the concept of equal access and, ultimately, of social equity. Equitable and just neighbourhoods of the future will not permit adult-only apartment buildings that discriminate against children and their parents. They will not turn their backs on the homeless. In the interests of co-operating with other neighbourhoods to build a wider, caring community they will voluntarily open their doors to new varieties of affordable housing and residential care facilities. Tomorrow's neighbourhoods will cease to compete for limited resources and opt instead for an open process of allocation based on need.

Neighbourhoods are Toronto's great strength. The vision of the future city and its neighbourhoods outlined above does not necessarily include Toronto as one of the so called "great" cities of the globe in the traditional sense. Greatness has its

price and is usually achieved at the expense of something else. To foster and promote Toronto as a true world city of the future an inordinate share of available resources may have to be allocated towards this goal. It is most likely that Toronto's neighbourhoods and its residents would pay the price.

3. EMERGING TRENDS AND CHALLENGES

Many of the emerging trends in Toronto's neighbourhoods can be viewed either as integrative forces which enhance neighbourhood life or as disintegrative forces which tend to separate people. Some trends may exhibit both of these qualities. In either case, these trends must be examined in order to anticipate how they will help or hinder the realization of the ideal future city.

3.1 Economic Restructuring Causes Chronic Unemployment/Creates New Opportunities

National and international economic trends, changes in the regional job market and restructuring in certain industrial sectors are all areas which are beyond the control of the City of Toronto. However, the loss of 1,200 jobs in the meatpacking industry or the gradual phasing out of Canadian branch plants of U.S. multinational corporations can be felt acutely in Toronto's neighbourhoods. According to the Social Planning Council, real unemployment in Metropolitan Toronto was estimated at 11.5% (or 202,000 persons) in 1983.

In the future permanent unemployment may be a way of life for many adults. Prolonged unemployment may mean that persons wanting to work will be outside of the labour force for years on end. At the same time, an entire generation of youth may be deprived of work experiences that can facilitate independence and career development.

Many of those who do work are likely to remain in the same positions for lengthy periods because of limited opportunities for upward mobility. Others will be faced with the need to retrain themselves on a frequent basis to meet the demands of technological innovation and change. Part-time work, job sharing and job exchanges will be looked at as serious alternatives.

At the neighbourhood level there is little doubt that family life will be profoundly affected by these conditions. Young people will likely stay at home longer and form families later because of their dependence on relatives for income support. Many families will be forced to cope with less household income and the stresses experienced by able-bodied persons who cannot find work.

In addition to the jobs that are lost because of plant closures, layoffs or technological change, new industrial jobs are decreasing because of pressures to convert existing industrial

land to non-industrial use. This is most pronounced in the City of Toronto where real and imagined land values reflect distances to the City core, effectively pricing industry out of the inner City real estate market. Recent examples of non-industrial uses on industrial land include a Loblaws Superstore at Leslie and Eastern, the Summit apartment complex at Bathurst and King and a mixed industrial-commercial development on Weston Road at the border between the City of Toronto and the City of York.

Rising unemployment and the continuously changing job situation also have created new opportunities. As people discover that they cannot find a suitable job (or any job for that matter), more are starting their own companies. Business schools at universities and community colleges are full of young people eager to acquire business expertise. They begin their careers in garages, basements and low-cost storefronts on commercial strips. Between 1975 and 1982 100% of all new jobs in Canada were being created by firms with less than 50 employees.

In direct contravention of the Zoning By-law many people work out of their houses, flats or apartments in occupations which require little more than a telephone line and an answering service. They may be renting their truck which can be parked on the street, they may be in the roofing, tailoring, hairdressing or child care business, they may be "immigration consultants" or the readers of tea leaves.

The "electronic cottage" has become a neighbourhood reality already. A growing number of professional people like planning consultants, architects and lawyers work out of their homes aided by sophisticated word processing and other micro computer equipment.

Neighbourhood planning can, of course, do little to alter the causes of unemployment. However, it can use some of the planning tools at its disposal to soften the effects. At present, we pretend that commercial and/or industrial activities do not exist in residential areas because they are not visible (we do not permit advertising). In the future, perhaps, existing residential land use regulations should be reviewed with the aim of allowing cottage industries and small business enterprises.

In order to leave room in the City of Toronto for new traditional and non-traditional industries, the few good industrial sites that are left will have to be retained. Commercial uses should only be permitted if they contribute to substantial industrial redevelopment. This approach can provide an economic incentive for the retention of industry. Toronto's new Economic Development Corporation, Cityjob, may also have an impact on the use of the City's remaining industrial base.

Another aspect of neighbourhood planning that can assist job creation or, at least, job retention is the ongoing work with Business Improvement Areas all across the City. Neighbourhood commercial strips on the Danforth, at Gerrard and Coxwell, on Queen and Dundas Streets West have received funds from the City's Commercial Area Improvement Fund to plant more trees, install street furniture and beautify sidewalks. Businessmen's organizations have been made aware of other sources of funding and have applied for grants for interior improvements and facade renovations to selected stores.

In the future, the business support function should be expanded. One exciting example of possible things to come is an attempt by a local businessmen's association on Bloor Street to jointly redevelop a site on their commercial strip for commercial-residential purposes. The local neighbourhood planner is an obvious resource person for facilitating such a project.

In Toronto, job creation through community economic development schemes has been limited. In the past, the programme has mainly focussed on distributing grants to socially worthwhile projects related to unemployment and skills upgrading. Some of these have successfully established themselves in their own right, such as a domestic cleaning service in the South Don area and a craft shop operated by ex-psychiatric patients in Parkdale.

In the future, emphasis will be placed on combining community development efforts with practical business suggestions. Neighbourhood planners are in a unique position to work with the community on identifying sub-groups that are hard to employ and design third sector business ventures which will eventually be able to make it on their own. The central goal of their efforts in this field is to demonstrate that the idea is feasible and warrants large-scale financial support from senior levels of government.

Although the number of jobs created through community economic development initially will be small, there will be cummulative effects and there is potential for expansion of the programme.

3.2 Demographic Changes Alter the Neighbourhood Fabric

For some time now planners, policy makers and tax collectors have monitored the City of Toronto's population decline. Between 1971 and 1981 the City lost almost 16% of its residents. Board of Education officials have had to cope with a 31.4% decrease in the number of children during the same period. As the total population has gone down, the number of people establishing independent households in City neighbourhoods has grown tremendously. Currently, 37.5% of all households in the City consist of only one person.

Additional figures for Metropolitan Toronto elaborate on the trends evident in the City. Metro's total population has grown by only 0.6%, while its number of households has increased by 8.9%. One in five families in Metropolitan Toronto (or over 20% of all families) is led by a single parent. Most of the single parents are women. Figures show that a large number of them live close to the poverty line. In 1980, the Metro Toronto Assisted Housing Study reported a median annual income of $11,000 for single parents included in their survey. To compound the situation, unemployment among all women who are heads of households is 65% higher on an average than among male heads of households. Even if they have a job, women tend to earn only 63% of the income an average man makes.

Some of these figures are alarming and the reasons for others are not at all clear. Do City of Toronto neighbourhoods attract single people with or without children because they want to live in the City or because the right accommodation and needed support services are missing from the suburbs? On the other hand, have people with children left the City because they could not find a suitable place to live?

A related and equally important trend in Toronto's neighbourhoods is the growing number of people over 65 years of age. The current percentage is 14%, the majority are women. The increasing prominence of older people is forcing the social service network to redirect its efforts dramatically. All aspects of community and neighbourhood life - income maintenance, neighbourhood safety, housing, health care, recreation, transportation - are being required to accommodate an aging population.

Changes in Toronto's ethnic make up also have been startling. Out of a City population of around 700,000, 52% were from the British Isles in 1961 and 46% in 1971. According to the latest Census, this figure has decreased to 39%. In 1961, people of Italian descent constituted 12% and, in 1971, 13% of the City's population and the Portuguese were not even listed as a separate group. Today, Portuguese is the second most spoken language in Toronto and the Italian "ethnic group" has decreased to 8%. As the ethnic composition of the City of Toronto changes, there are parallel changes in service requirements and level of political participation.

The increase in childless households and single parent families, the growing incidence of divorce and separation and the proliferation of alternative living arrangements have prompted concerns that the family based neighbourhood is disintegrating. To some, the slow but inevitable transformation of the nuclear family has created an erosion of sources of identity, stability and attachment in the neighbourhood. Of course, one can also see these trends as integrative forces, leading to more diverse and mutually supportive neighbourhoods.

It is difficult to predict whether the present demographic trends will continue, accelerate or level off. In any event, this is one area where neighbourhood planning is unable to intervene directly. However, planners should attempt to contribute to the formulation of new social service policies at Metro, at the Province and in Ottawa.

People who work at the neighbourhood planning level are in a good position to help residents articulate their service needs. This knowledge can be fed into the policy making process. However, they can also attempt to use traditional planning tools to gain specific services. We can recommend that the City acquire a park in a park deficient neighbourhood. We can achieve the same objective during the residential or commercial-residential rezoning process by insisting that a certain amount of land be set aside for public park purposes. We can negotiate on behalf of Council for work place daycare, space for a community health centre or public access to private recreation facilities. In future, a levy on development proposals may be considered which would be clearly earmarked for community services.

Thus, although neighbourhood planning cannot deal directly with the effects of population change, it can attempt to ensure that new population sub-groups in neighbourhoods are adequately served.

3.3 Gentrification and Income Polarization May Lead to an "Elite City"

Gentrification (or "whitepainting") is the slow takeover of working class and ethnic neighbourhoods by the urban "gentry". Although often heralded as the return of the suburban middle class to the central city it is also the establishment of new households by young professionals. They select less expensive, but attractive City locations. Don Vale, Cabbagetown, Bellwoods, Riverdale, Kensington - the list is virtually endless.

There are of course, reasons for the continuing spread of gentrification. Toronto's neighbourhoods are good places to live. They have human scale brick housing on quiet streets with mature trees. They are interesting from an architectural standpoint and offer convenient access to local services and shopping.

Gentrification has brought mixed blessings to Toronto neighbourhoods. It has introduced professional and political expertise which have forced open City Hall's doors and have delivered improvements in neighbourhood services and environmental conditions. In one of the City's Wards a local meatpacking firm recently agreed to install deordorizing equipment (a first in North America) at the insistence of new local residents. As well, the renovations undertaken during the gentrification process maintain and improve the City's housing stock. For a while, at least, gentrification increases the neighbourhood social mix.

Why, then, is neighbourhood planning so concerned about this phenomenon? Gentrification has caused substantial loss of multiple rental units through deconversion. Houses that used to be home to two, three or four families are now occupied by a childless couple. Gentrification has made house prices and rents go up and has changed the character and function of many Toronto neighbourhoods. The Annex, the Beach, Cabbagetown, are well known examples of this trend.

Because many of Toronto's neighbourhoods are so much in demand lower income groups are slowly being moved out of the City. Those low income persons who remain live in assisted housing projects or otherwise subsidized residential units. The sharp polarization between the poor in Regent Park and Blake Street and the affluent in Cabbagetown and Riverdale around Withrow Park has become an established social phenomenon.

This polarization is also evident in the figures. Today, 23% of the total population of the City of Toronto have an annual income of less than $10,000. 42% of Metro Toronto's neediest children live in City of Toronto neighbourhoods. 13% of these live in families receiving social assistance. Social service agencies report an alarming number of children in the foodlines. Homeless or transient youth and child prostitutes of both sexes are on the increase. People fishing for coins in the ventilation grates around Trinity Square and pan handling at Yonge and Eglinton have become common. Continuous gentrification and further income polarization would appear to set Toronto firmly on the course towards the "Elite (Executive) City".

The poor will become more and more disenfranchised. The rich-poor gap will continue to grow and with it inequities will increase. Neighbourhood service priorities will be directed towards property protection, support for working professional parents and leisure activities. Low income people will have to go outside their neighbourhoods for their daily needs since they cannot afford the expensive specialty stores that surround them.

An Elite City is contrary to the goal of diverse neighbourhoods. However, in the face of the seemingly overwhelming trend towards further gentrification and income polarization, what can neighbourhood planning achieve? Neighbourhood planning policies like historic preservation, through traffic controls, low density zoning designations and environmental protection often accelerate the process of gentrification. As neighbourhoods go through this cycle, neighbourhood residents tend to become more protectionist. Increasingly, elected officials will be forced to make tough decisions about how to balance local versus City policy objectives.

The single, most important strategy is to minimize the worst effects of these trends. Obviously, neighbourhood planning is in

no position to achieve this on its own. We will have to work with elected officials, with those in other parts of the public sector, with service providers, with affected community groups and with the residents themselves. We will need to encourage dialogue at all levels of government to develop new solutions. We may have to begin looking at land use regulations and development projects from the point of view of whether they help or hinder neighbourhood diversity.

3.4 Housing Alternatives Have To Be Found

What do statistics tell us? In 1982 3,400 people in Metro Toronto lacked a fixed address. About 1,100 of these were in the City of Toronto. In the City single adults on general welfare assistance have $39-$76 per month left to live on after they pay their rents. Only 37% of apartments in the City of Toronto allow families with children. In May, 1984, there were 12,000 people on the waiting list of Cityhome (the City's non-profit housing agency) in need of assisted housing.

While there may not be an overall housing crisis in Toronto's neighbourhoods, there is definitely a crisis of suitable and/or affordable housing. Population sub-groups that urgently need places to live include senior citizens, families with children, single parents and low income single people. The only affordable rental housing exists in rent-controlled buildings, co-op, non-profit and public housing projects and a trickle of new construction. Accommodation in legal and illegal boarding and lodging houses, attic and basement flats is hard to find and often not cheap. Since many of the senior citizens and most of the single parent households are women, we are experiencing the disturbing phenomenon of women and children being locked out of our neighbourhoods.

In addition, the City of Toronto is becoming home to special population groups which need life skills training and assistance with the task of daily living. These include: children, who may be juvenile delinquents, developmentally or physically handicapped; homeless youth without education, employment and social skills; developmentally and physically handicapped adults; persons with mental illness; offenders and ex-offenders; socially disadvantaged people such as battered women and indigent men and women.

Some of these groups are being deinstitutionalized while others are receiving social assistance for the first time. The important point in the context of neighbourhoods is that these groups are no longer accepting isolation in institutions, enduring a mean existence away from neighbourhood life and public concern. As part of a growing self-help movement they are pushing into full view demanding community-based residential care and support services. They have never had or have lost the opportunities and security

afforded by family households. They are developing alternate household forms where they can be loved and cared for in our neighbourhoods.

Deinstitutionalization and placement of special populations into more cost-effective and humane supportive housing arrangements are fundamental aspects of Ontario social policy. They are having a dramatic effect on the structure and image of Toronto neighbourhoods.

Foster homes, group homes, emergency shelters, hostels, nursing homes, correctional centres and other quasi-institutional facilities may or may not be acceptable to neighbourhood residents. Zoning restrictions or organized local opposition can effectively block the establishment of any one of these uses. In this respect supportive housing providers find themselves in the same quandary as seniors co-op and non-profit housing agencies. Cityhome and co-op groups have trouble finding suitable sites because of zoning restrictions and the general stigma of "public housing" that conjures up the image of immediately and rapidly falling property values and neighbourhood instability. Individual owners of older properties who want to make use of government programmes like "Convert-to-rent" or "Add-a-Unit" find themselves caught in innumerable government regulations and Zoning By-law requirements that often are impossible to meet. Many give up in despair.

Housing policy has been traditionally at the centre of neighbourhood planning in Toronto. The establishment of the City's Housing Department and of Cityhome in the mid-seventies was largely due to the efforts of City staff and politicians committed to the idea of non-profit housing.

Given present and likely future trends and the apparent lack of interest by senior levels of government to continue past non-profit housing programs, more creative approaches at the municipal level are urgently needed. Neighbourhood planners should work closely with their colleagues in the Housing Department and the non-profit sector to find ways and means to provide low cost housing to tomorrow's neighbourhood residents.

To guarantee comfortable, secure shelter for all of Toronto's population, one may have to consider whether some of the present housing standards are a luxury which future residents will not be able to afford. Alternate ways of financing municipal housing should actively be pursued such as purchasing a large site with landbanking funds and financing construction from the profits generated through the resale of part of the property. Other possibilities include a separate development levy in Toronto to be used exclusively for low cost housing and the generation of funds from borrowing against existing housing stock which is no longer subject to CMHC control.

Using traditional planning tools, neighbourhood planning offers opportunities to negotiate for non-profit housing sites during the rezoning process for private development projects. Also, we can stay in touch with Cityhome about potential changes in land use policies from non-residential to residential. Occasionally, public utilities such as a City or Metro Works Yard will relocate freeing up suitable housing sites.

In general, existing Zoning By-law provisions will have to be examined which now stand in the way of providing affordable housing. Certain types of mini-institutions will have to be accommodated as well. Many of these should contain built-in support services and employment opportunities. Less used neighbourhood institutions such as churches or schools offer possibilities for innovative communal housing alternatives, with or without space to work, with or without neighbourhood services. A few examples of this mixed use concept exist already. Two postal stations in Toronto accommodate federal correctional residential centres. Many churches have been exploring the potential of residential uses on their properties to help with operating expenses and, at the same time, achieve certain social objectives. The Dovercourt Baptist Church at Bloor and Dufferin Streets built a senior citizens' tower some years ago and the Walmer Road Baptist Church is currently pursuing similar ideas.

To gain acceptance for innovative housing alternatives, neighbourhood planning in co-operation with the Housing Department, the non-profit sector, the development community and City Council, should begin a long-term educational outreach programme. Only through exposure to facts and figures - and some real life examples - will neighbourhood residents begin to overcome their fear and resistance. This will be one of the most difficult, but most important issues to address for planners, politicians and residents.

3.5 Neighbourhoods Experience Even Greater Racial and Ethnic Diversity

Developments in the ethnic community are among the most integrative trends in Toronto's neighbourhoods today. Although federal policy has cut back the number of immigrant arrivals, family members are allowed to be sponsored. Coming from cultures where nuclear and extended family values are strong, immigrant populations are a force in family household formation. This has an impact on school enrolment and curricula, recreation and daycare programs.

In many of Toronto's neighbourhoods Asians, East and West Indians, Italians, Chinese or Portuguese have established a solid commercial presence. Often, they have continued in occupations they held prior to coming to Toronto. In some cases they have brought with them investment capital.

For all their economic and cultural impact on Toronto's neighbourhoods, the various ethnic groups are not well connected to municipal government. They tend to consult professional people in their own communities rather than relying on local government bureaucrats who may be perceived as not trustworthy. As a result, they lack information on how to obtain the services they are entitled to and established channels through which they can communicate new service needs.

Neighbourhood planning has not been too successful in making connections with all parts of Toronto's ethnic community. The exceptions have been planners who speak the language of the people with whom they are dealing.

In the future, we can expect that second generation immigrants will feel far less alienated from government and will make demands for their rightful share of available resources. There is no reason to believe that they will be exempt from the harsh effects of unemployment and income polarization. In some cases, discrimination or prejudice may make these problems more severe for immigrant groups.

Neighbourhood planning should make it possible for all types of people in the neighbourhoods to be involved in its work. To reach the ethnic community, planners should begin by firming up established links with ethnic agencies and community leaders. They should commit themselves to an extensive community development program. This could involve assigning people to do outreach work to bring individuals together around issues which are important to them. Eventually, it would result in a greater understanding of and closer links with municipal government. Since a diverse ethnic community is vital to the goal of a liveable and equitable city, this should be a matter of priority.

3.6 Political Changes Offer New Opportunities

Current economic and demographic trends will have an effect on Toronto politics. As the competition for public resources increases, there will be greater demands for political accountability. Public expenditures will come under intense scrutiny.

Because of the increase in public debate and the need to fight for available resources, there will be a substantial increase in political awareness. As groups and individuals currently outside of the political arena make their entry in their bid for power and their share of public benefits, equity in the distribution of public services will become a major issue.

Since financial resources may not be sufficient to meet rising demands, political division in Toronto's communities is likely to

intensify. Established neighbourhoods will not take kindly to suggestions that they relinquish a part of their share of the pie.

The forum in which these conflicts will increasingly be acted out is Toronto's regional government, the Metro Toronto Council. Direct elections to this Council - rather than the present system of representation from the local area municipal councils - are likely to be introduced in time for the 1988 municipal elections. Local political platforms will have to include policy initiatives for such Metro issues as the proposed radial subway line, police reform, senior citizens housing and daycare. Metro politicians may have a clearer mandate to balance the aspirations of local neighbourhoods against the needs of the community as a whole.

As the City of Toronto is being called upon to deliver services and assume responsibilities that used to be the purview of other levels of government, there will be demands for a drastic reordering of legislative powers and financial arrangements resulting in expanded local autonomy. To carry out these new responsibilities the City will have to reduce its dependece on realty taxes and program-specific transfer payments. Instead, it may have to be given access to other revenue sources such as a share of the income tax.

In parallel with the shift of social service responsibilities from the regional to the local level, many services are being decentralized down to the neighbourhood level. Day care, community health centres, alternative schools, multi-purpose community centres and immigrant services are joining traditional municipal services like Parks and Recreation, Buildings and Inspections, and Planning and Development site offices. The Public Health Department's recent reorganization into a decentralized community-based operation complete with area offices is one of the most recent examples in Toronto's municipal administration.

Decentralized community services offer neighbourhood residents easier access and the opportunity to become involved in priority setting. Like public participation in planning, being involved in setting neighbourhood service priorities gives residents a chance to discover the limitations and opportunities inherent in local government. Demands for more information, for services which are lacking or even for a real decentralization of municipal decision-making may result.

Given the growing propensity for increased political conflict among competing "public interests" and an emerging trend of decentralization, what will be the role of neighbourhood planning?

Neighbourhood planning will have to devote much more attention to understanding the local implications of Metro land use and social service priorities. In addition, because of neighbourhood

planners' work with neighbourhood residents, they will be able to contribute to policy making at the Metro level by pointing out gaps in services or special needs that may arise. This will necessitate close co-operation with the Metro Planning and the Metro Community Services Departments. Planners may be increasingly called upon to assume a mediating function among different groups competing for their share of public resources.

The challenge will be how to ensure that less powerful communities are represented when political decisions about future resource allocations are made.

4. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING WILL HAVE TO INTERVENE MORE EFFECTIVELY

Neighbourhood planning in Toronto became institutionalized ten years ago in response to a large number of factors. Some were internal to the profession and others originated from political forces at all levels. Proposals for expressway construction and high rise office and apartment redevelopment throughout the City were perceived by residents as threats to neighbourhood stability. In response, they pulled together, organized, demanded that their neighbourhoods be protected. They elected politicians who sympathized with their views. They lobbied to have land use regulations adjusted to ensure that their neighbourhoods would be safe from outside intrusions.

Neighbourhood planners were hired and were instructed by Council to plan "with" the community rather than "for" the community - out of storefront offices across the City. "Neighbourhood preservation" was adopted as the objective and "citizen participation" became the methodology.

In the years that followed, mounds of neighbourhood plans were produced, each extolling the unique virtues of a particular area of the city, each devising a unique and clever technique for neighbourhood preservation. What began primarily as an attempt to preserve residential neighbourhoods evolved over time to include the preservation of industrial areas and the promotion of commercial strips over plaza-type developments.

But it soon became apparent that many neighbourhood groups which sprung up during this period did not necessarily feel comfortable with the diversity of people and land uses in their areas. Having successfully fought off high rise redevelopment they now concentrated on what their neighbourhoods might become. In the name of neighbourhood preservation they advocated traffic control plans, parking for residents only, and the elimination of all nearby industrial activities. They became more and more opposed to change. By-and-large neighbourhood planners shared this vision of neighbourhood preservation. Their plan-making eliminated the possibility of fundamental change and limited the range of choices.

All of this concentrated planning activity made it apparent that the then existing planning tools for controlling and influencing future land uses were woefully inadequate. Throughout the 70's, the City of Toronto acquired powers which municipalities had never been able to exercise before: bonusing for social housing and historic preservation purposes; demolition control over residential properties; site-plan control in designated areas; the power to pass interim control by-laws. Many of these were tested and refined in the City and are now part of Ontario planning legislation.

If the 70's in Toronto were the days of plan-making, the 80's are focussing on plan refinements and plan implementation. Since traditional land use planning aims to produce plans, the planners' role in their implementation has never been defined clearly. Some neighbourhood planners have become the keepers of the status quo through complex by-laws which are incomprehensible to almost everyone. Others spend their work days on development control and the processing of applications, both intended results of neighbourhood plans which wanted to retain control over redevelopment.

At the grass roots level, some have specialized in articulating particular community issues in the human services field. The disabled and elderly, supportive housing, day care and children's services are among them.

In general, there seems to be confusion about what kind of role neighbourhood planners are or should be performing. Many people think that planners basically deal with whatever issues they are requested to work on, without being able to influence the direction of their work. Some believe that, in the future, they should be limited to providing technical advice to City Council on land use issues. Others suggest that they should focus their energies on working towards narrowing the gap between rich and poor, advocating on behalf of those who are unable to do it for themselves.

Neither of these positions reflect the reality of neighbourhood planning in the City of Toronto. Neighbourhood planners, just as their counterparts in other municipal departments, work in a political and administrative context which defines much of what they do. The challenge is to determine approaches to issues or recommend priorities which will help City neighbourhoods remain and/or become liveable, diverse and equitable.

In order to respond to the trends that are evident today in a manner that brings us closer to the kind of City outlined earlier, neighbourhood planners need to expand their skills (rather than narrowing their role). They will have to be able to function at a variety of levels in many different circumstances. First and foremost they will continue to act as advisors to City Council on

a whole variety of issues. The need to solve problems with less money will require innovation. Because the key issues are inter-jurisdictional, planners will find themselves working constantly with professionals from diverse backgrounds and at different levels of society--police, public health officials, lobbyists, social workers, developers, management consultants, church leaders and fund raisers.

In a different context, planners will be called upon to be mediators and negotiators among competing interests to resolve local area conflicts and to get the best and most appropriate deals for City neighbourhoods. They will continue to act as advocates for specific planning concerns such as the revitalization of commercial strips, supportive housing or urban design. They will need to expand their capacity for building networks among professionals from other departments and other levels of government as well as among agencies and lobby groups concerned with certain issues. They will also have to become more effective than they have been of late as community development people, as facilitators of processes which are meaningful for those who volunteer their time and energy to become involved.

Many neighbourhood planners are quite comfortable in any or all of these roles. The role that some have difficulty accepting and defining - and the role which may be the most important one for shaping the ideal city of tomorrow - is that of "interventionist".

The "interventionist" role combines many traditional neighbourhood planning roles. However, it requires a more active approach to problem solving. It presupposes that neighbourhood planners are well aware of the various avenues through which costs and benefits accrue to City neighbourhoods. With that knowledge, it will be possible to recognize and use opportunities for furthering the cause of tomorrow's neighbourhoods. With the support of City Council, neighbourhood planners will have to develop appropriate strategies on how and when to intervene and recommend ways of how to assess whether these strategies are effective.

Throughout this paper we have suggested ways and means through which neighbourhood planning can help shape a future Toronto. We have urged that renewed and immediate attention be given to the housing field; we have called for an advocacy role for Toronto's neighbourhoods; we have put forward the idea of using municipal pilot projects to demonstrate the feasibility of a new program. All of these areas can benefit from intelligent and focussed intervention by neighbourhood planners. It is always possible to try a new angle, an approach that has been overlooked so far. It is always rewarding to discover a seldom used route towards one's goal -- and it quite often works.